Case: 12-2479 Document: 40-1 Page: 1 09/27/2012 731928 126

12-2479-cv

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE SECOND CIRCUIT

JOSHUA MARSHALL,

Plaintiff-Appellee,

-against-

P.O. SALIM RANDALL, Shield No. 15331, Individually and in His Official Capacity, P.O. MICHAEL BURBRIDGE, Shield No. 15488, Individually and in His Official Capacity,

Defendants-Appellants,

-and-

THE CITY OF NEW YORK, JOHN DOE, P.O.'s # 1-10 Individually and in Their Official Capacities (the name John Doe being fictitious, as the true names are presently unknown),

Defendants.

ON APPEAL FROM THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

JOINT APPENDIX Volume V of V (pp. A1204-1485)

> MICHAEL A. CARDOZO, Corporation Counsel of the City of New York, Attorney for Defendant-Appellant, 100 Church Street, New York, New York 10007. (212) 788-1010

COHEN & FITCH LLP, Attorneys for Plaintiff-Appellee, 233 Broadway, Suite 1800, New York, NY 10279. (212) 374-9115

LAW OFFICES OF JON L. NORINSBERG 225 Broadway, Suite 2700 New York, New York 10007 (212) 791-5396

INDEX TO VOLUMES

	<u>Page</u>
Volume I	A1-A300
Volume II	A301-A601
Volume III	A602-A902
Volume IV	A903-A1203
Volume V	A1204-A1485

Case: 12-2479 Document: 40-1 Page: 3 09/27/2012 731928 126

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
Docket Entries	A1
Complaint, Dated Ju	ne 8, 2010
	Jew York, Randall and Burbridge's per 8, 2010
	of Motion for Summary Judgment, 2011
Read in Support of D	Stavridis, Dated September 9, 2011, Defendants' Motion for Summary exed Exhibits
Exhibit A -	Complaint, Dated June 8, 2010
Exhibit B -	Defendants City of New York, Randall and Burbridge 's Answer, Dated October 8, 2010
Exhibit C -	ECF Civil Docket Sheet
Exhibit D -	Order, Dated June 29, 2011
Exhibit E -	Complaint and Arrest Reports
Exhibit F -	Property Clerk's Invoice, Dated May 15, 2008
Exhibit G -	Finest Message Switching System Printout, Dated May 15, 2008A93
Exhibit H -	NYPD Police Firearm Laboratory Report, Dated May 19, 2008
Exhibit I -	Stop, Search and Frisk Report for Demetrius Meade
Exhibit J -	Criminal Court Complaint, Dated May 15, 2008, in People of the State of New York v Marshall
Exhibit K -	Grand Jury Indictment, Dated May 20, 2008, in People of the State of New York v Marshall
Exhibit L -	Decision and Order, Dated May 27, 2009 in <u>The People of the State of New York</u> v. Marshall
Exhibit M -	Document Related to the Dismissal of Charges against Plaintiff

Case: 12-2479 Document: 40-1 Page: 4 09/27/2012 731928 126

ii

		<u>Page</u>
Exhibit N -	Excerpt of Grand Jury Minutes, Dated May 19, 2008, in The People of the State of New York v. Marshall	A117
Exhibit O -	Excerpt of Grand Jury Minutes, Dated May 19, 2008, in The People of the State of New York v. Marshall	A156
Exhibit P -	Excerpt of Deposition Transcript of Michael Burbridge, Dated May 26, 2011	A195
Exhibit Q -	Order, Dated April 8, 2011, in Marshall v. City of New York	A247
	nt of Undisputed Facts Pursuant 6.1, Dated September 9, 2011	A250
	Stavridis, Dated September 14, 2011, Defendants' Motion for Summary Judgment	A256
Exhibit O -	Examination Before Trial Transcript of Joshua Marshall, Dated April 26, 2011	A259
Letter, Dated Septem from Jon L. Norinsbe	ber 21, 2011, erg to the Honorable Jack B. Weinstein	A465
	ber 22, 2011, to the Honorable Jack B. Weinstein,	A468
Attachment -	Defendants' Memorandum of Law, Dated September 22, 2011, Read in Support of Their Motion for Summary Judgment	A470
Order Granted Extens	sion, Dated September 26, 2011	A490
Order Granting Leave	e, Dated September 28, 2011	A493
	ndum of Law, Dated September 22, 2011, t of Motion for Summary Judgment	A495

Case: 12-2479 Document: 40-1 Page: 5 09/27/2012 731928 126

iii

in Opposition	. Norinsberg, Dated October 28, 2011, to Defendants' Motion for Summary Judgment, its	A
Exhibit A -	Excerpt of Examination Before Trial Transcript of Joshua Marshall, Dated April 26, 2011	A
Exhibit B -	Excerpt of Deposition Transcript of Michael Burbridge, Dated May 26, 2011	A
Exhibit C -	Excerpt of Deposition Transcript of Salim Randall	A
Exhibit D -	Excerpt of Grand Jury Transcript Testimony of Michael Burbridge	A
Exhibit E -	Excerpt of Grand Jury Transcript Testimony of Salim Randall	A
Exhibit F -	NYPD Complaint Report Worksheet, Dated May 15, 2008	A
Exhibit G -	NYPD Request of Laboratory Examination Report, Dated May 15, 2008	A
Exhibit H -	NYPD Evidence Collection Team Report, Dated May 15, 2008	A
Exhibit I -	Arrest Report	A
Exhibit J -	NYPD Complaint Follow Up Information Report, Dated May 15, 2008	A
Exhibit K -	Civilian Complaint Review Board's Case Closing Form, with Additional Documents	A
Exhibit L -	Complaint Room Screening Sheet	A
Exhibit M -	Arrest and Complaint Reports	A

iv

		<u>Page</u>
Plaintiff's Local Ru	ıle 56.1(b) Statement, Dated October 28, 2011	A683
-	e to Defendants' Local Rule 56.1(b) Detober 28, 2011	A686
1 7	Memorandum of Law, Dated November 15, 2011, pport of Defendants' Motion for Summary Judgment	A691
Transcript, Dated N	November 28, 2011	A707
Memorandum Orde	er and Judgment, Dated November 29, 2011	A737
	ndum of Law, Dated April 9, 2012, Plaintiff's Motion in Limine	A741
Plaintiff's Request	to Charge, Dated April 9, 2012	A771
	n in Limine, Dated April 12, 2012, bits	A802
Exhibit A -	Excerpt of Examination Before Trial Transcript of Joshua Marshall, Dated April 26, 2011	A830
Exhibit B -	Office of Chief Medical Examiner's Laboratory Report, Dated June 10, 2008	A841
Trial Transcript, Da	nted April 16, 2012	A843
	18, 2012, from Gerald Cohen and othe Honorable Jack B. Weinstein	A887
	ions to Proposed Jury Charge,	A893
	n for Reconsideration of the Court's Ruling nts' Motion in Limine, Dated April 20, 2012	A905
Trial Transcript, Da	ted April 23, 2012	A913
Trial Transcript, Da	ted April 24, 2012	A945
Trial Transcript Da	ted April 25, 2012	Δ1187

 \mathbf{V}

		<u>Page</u>
,	Pated April 25, 2012, Read in Support tions, with Annexed Exhibits	A1245
Exhibit A -	Excerpt of Trial Transcript, Dated April 23, 2012	A1257
Exhibit B -	Excerpt of Examination Before Trial Transcript of Joshua Marshall, Dated April 26, 2011	A1263
Exhibit C -	Excerpt of Trial Transcript, Dated April 24, 2012	A1267
	for a Mistrial/Memorandum of Law, 2, with Annexed Exhibits	A1274
Exhibit A -	Excerpt of Special Interrogatories	A1286
Exhibit B -	Excerpt of Trial Transcript, Dated April 25, 2012	A1289
Trial Transcript, Date	ed April 26, 2012	A1300
Plaintiff's Exhibits		A1326
Defendants' Exhibits	S	A1350
Court's Exhibits		A1354
Verdict Sheet		A1478
Order, Dated April 2	7, 2012	A1482
Notice of Appeal, Da	ited June 15, 2012	A1484

vi

INDEX TO EXHIBITS

PLAINTIFF'S		<u>REPRODUCED</u>
1.	Excerpt of Memobook	A1327
2.	NYPD Complaint Report Worksheet, Dated May 15, 2008	A1330
3.	Redacted NYPD Evidence Collection Team Report, Dated May 15, 2008	A1335
6.	Arrest Report	A1337
11.	Stop, Search and Frisk Report	A1341
16.	Complaint Report	A1344
17.	Statement of Charges	A1347
18.	Certificate of Disposition Dismissal	A1349
<u>DEFI</u>	ENDANTS'	REPRODUCED
E.	Photograph	A1351
G.	Photograph	A1353

vii

INDEX TO EXHIBITS (CONTINUED)

COU	IRT'S	REPRODUCED
1.	Criminalist Report (Entered April 24, 2012)	A1355
1.	Defendants' Brief (Entered April 25, 2012)	A1358
1.	Defendants' Motion for a Mistrial (Entered April 26, 2012)	A1383
2.	Jury Charge (Entered April 25, 2012)	A1406
2.	Jury Note (Entered April 26, 2012)	A1421
3.	Superseded Jury Charge	A1423
4.	Proposed Jury Charge, Dated April 20, 2012	A1438
5.	Proposed Jury Charge, Dated April 17, 2012	A1453
6.	List of Witnesses	A1467
7.	List of Exhibits	A1469
8.	Jury Note	A1471
9.	Jury Note	A1473
10.	Jury Note	A1475
11.	Jury Note	A1477

Case: 12-2479 Document: 40-1 Page: 10 09/27/2012 731928 126

A1204

	CROSS - MS. LAMOUSE-SMITH 65		REDIRECT - MS. LAMOUSE-SMITH 66
1	recovered with respect to this gun, would it be would you	1	Q You were asked on cross-examination if you received any
2	would your office be able to test the DNA on the	2	request from the prosecutor or from our office to test the
3	cartridges?	3	remaining samples, right?
4	THE COURT: Don't answer.	4	A Correct.
5	Q Could the cartridges yield DNA evidence?	5	Q Did you receive a request from the plaintiff, either
6	THE COURT: Don't answer.	6	Mr. Norinsberg or Mr. Cohen, did you receive a request from
7	Q Is it possible to swab the evidence that is currently	7	them to test the DNA?
8	present in the NYPD for the high yield testing that high	8	MR. COHEN: Objection.
9	sensitivity testing that you just described?	9	THE COURT: I'll allow it.
10	A I'm not sure I understand the question.	10	THE WITNESS: Not to my knowledge, no.
11	Q If there are parts of this gun that were recovered that	11	MS. CASTRO: Thank you.
12	were not swabbed originally, can they be swabbed today and	ble2	THE COURT: All right. That will be all.
13	submitted to your it office for testing?	13	MR. COHEN: Can I have one more question?
14	MS. CASTRO: Objection.	14	THE COURT: Yes, you may ask your question.
15	THE COURT: I'll allow it.	15	RECROSS-EXAMINATION
16	THE WITNESS: Yes.	16	BY MR. COHEN:
17	Q So there are parts I withdraw that. Your office	17	Q As far as you know the reports that you have in front of
18	hasn't been asked to test those items, have they?	18	you regarding this case, you turned them over to defense
19	A Not to my knowledge, no.	19	counsel just this week, isn't that right?
20	MR. COHEN: I have no further questions for the	20	MS. CASTRO: Objection.
21	witness. Thank you.	21	THE COURT: If you know.
22	THE COURT: Any re-direct?	22	A Well, there are two reports in this case. The first
23	MS. CASTRO: Just briefly, your Honor.	23	report from 2008 was reported out in the normal course of
24	REDIRECT EXAMINATION	24	business once the file was reviewed. And then a request for a
25	BY MS. CASTRO:	25	certified copy of the file was made in 2011. And then

	RECROSS - MS. LAMOUSE-SMITH 67	
1	yesterday I had to prepare another report regarding my	1
2	testimony that was turned over to defense counsel.	2
3	Q And your report, just so the evidence is very clear here,	3
4	your report says there was an insufficient sample, correct?	4
5	A Yes.	5
6	Q It doesn't say oh, well, we have an extract which we can	6
7	do high sensitivity testing on, but we're not doing it?	7
8	THE COURT: Don't answer that.	8
9	MS. CASTRO: Objection.	9
10	MR. COHEN: Thank you. No further questions.	10
11	THE COURT: Thank you very much,	11
12	(Witness leaves the stand.)	12
13	THE COURT: Any further witnesses?	13
14	MS. CASTRO: No, your Honor, not at this time.	14
15	THE COURT: Any rebuttal witnesses?	15
16	MR. NORJNSBERG: No, your Honor.	16
17	MS. CASTRO: The defense rests, your Honor.	17
18	THE COURT: All right. We've heard all the evid	e 18 e
19	and now we'll hear summations. Do you want a short break	19
20	MR. NORINSBERG: Yes, please.	20
21	THE COURT: Okay. Take a ten-minute break, p	e a te
22	(Jury is out of the courtroom 11:27 a.m.)	22
23	(Continued on the next page.)	23

MARY AGNES DRURY, RPR - Official Court Reporter

24

25

RECROSS - MS. LAMOUSE-SMITH 68

THE COURT: You have a motion?

MS. CASTRO: Yes, your Honor. At this point, the Defendants wish to renew their Rule 50 motion with respect to the false arrest claim. Defendants submit that given all their testimony, both in Plaintiff's case in chief as well as in the Defendant's case in chief, there's sufficient evidence to establish that there was probable cause for the arrest. Specifically, Officer Randall testified that he observed Plaintiff making the movements, removing an object from his waistband, and throwing it. Officer Burbridge testified that he saw the Plaintiff throw the gun. Officer Fox corroborates that information.

He testified that he kept his eye on the Plaintiff's associate the entire time. He had his hands up. It was impossible for him to have been the one to throw the gun. Based on that evidence, we submit to you that there was probable cause for the arrest. For that reason, the false arrest claim should be dismissed.

THE COURT: Denied. There's an issue of e. credibility.

MS, CASTRO: With respect to the malicious prosecution claim, Officer Burbridge testified that he only spoke with the district attorney's office for five minutes in preparation for his grand jury testimony. The only testimony

A1205

24

1

10

11

12

14

15

17

19

PROCEEDINGS that he gave in the criminal trial was at the grand jury. 1 1 2 2 Based on your Honor's charge that the Defendant 3 cannot be held liable for what he said to the grand jury as well as to what he said to the prosecutor in preparation for 4 4 5 his grand jury testimony, we submit that the claim of malicious prosecution should be dismissed against him. THE COURT: Denied. It's an appropriate inference 8 that a well-advised prosecutor would have consulted with the 8 Q defendants during the course of this long prosecution. 10 MS. CASTRO: I do note for the record that there is 0 11 11 no evidence of that, your Honor. 12 12 THE COURT: Yes. 13 MS. CASTRO: We also move for a qualified immunity 14 We renew this motion because again, based on the officer's 14 15 testimony that they observed the Plaintiff throw the gun or 15 what appeared to be the gun, based on the charge and based onto 16 17 your Honor's belief that the reasonableness of their belief, 17 even if it had been mistaken, is grounds for a dismissal on 18 18 19 qualified immunity. 19 THE COURT: Denied. There's an issue of veracity20 20 21 MS. CASTRO: Thank you, your Honor. 21 22 MS. SANDS: Your Honor, one point. If the jury 22 23 should come back with a verdict against the officers, we ask 23

PROCEEDINGS 70 disbanded.

THE COURT: Denied. Bring in the jury. Too late. We've had a long discussion of these problems.

(The jury entered.)

THE COURT: Be seated, please. You'll now hear the summations, ladies and gentlemen. What the attorneys say is not evidence, but they're going to try to help you analyze the evidence, so listen carefully. You will not have any of what they say read back.

Proceed, please.

MS. SANDS: Thank you.

MR. NORINSBERG: Thank you, your Honor.

Good morning, folks. Before we start, I just want to extend thanks to you on behalf of everyone here. We realize not just that you were giving us your time, but we can see from the way you've been paying attention that you take your job very seriously in this case. And you understand how important the case is to us. So we want to just thank you for doing that and really doing the job the best you can.

At this point, you've heard all of the evidence in this case. And I understand, a lot of times, it's rapid-fire questioning and things don't necessarily come in in perfect order, but what I would like to do right now is simply walk through the evidence with you, piece it back together in a logical, coherent way, and present it to you. And then, you

JUDI JOHNSON, RPR, CRR, CLR - Official Court Reporter

PROCEEDINGS

decide this case.

24

1

2

3

4

5

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

25

Now, in deciding the case, it seems to me the whole case really comes down to one central issue, and that is this: 3 Did Joshua Marshall have a gun on him on May 15th, 2008? Now cross-examination, ladies and gentlemen, did we impeach this there are some cases where you have multiple different scenarios and possibilities. This isn't one of them. There's no middle ground on this case. Either this man was carrying a7 gun on him as he was charged with, or he wasn't. There's n 8 middle ground.

that we be allowed to submit a question or two of special

interrogatories that could be given to the jury before they're 25 JUDI JOHNSON, RPR, CRR, CLR - Official Court Reporter

And I'm going to take it a step further here. Because of the fact that the parties here completely contradict each other on this critical fact, there is no question that one side has lied in this courtroom. There's no 13 room for a third possibility. Somebody's telling the truth, somebody's not. So the way I see it, as I'm framing the issue before we talk about the evidence, is to put it back to you, as jurors, to say your primary function here is to determine who is telling the truth and who is not. Did this man have a 18 gun, or did he not?

Now, to make that determination, let's take a look 20 back at some of the testimony that we've heard in this case. 21 We're going to start with Officer Randall, the arresting 22 officer in this case. Now, you folks heard Officer Randall 23 yesterday morning. How did Officer Randall strike you? Did24 he strike you as a credible witness? Did he strike you as

somebody whose testimony was consistent with his prior testimony? Did he strike you as somebody that can be relied upon? How many times during the course of that officer with his prior testimony? And to be clear about it, the questions that are being asked are almost verbatim questions that last year, he gave one answer to; a year later, he gives a completely different answer. How many times?

PROCEEDINGS

And not just that, but look at some of the things. Last year, how many times did he answer under oath he can't remember something. A year later, he comes in front of a jury where it's not going to look so good to come in here and say you can't remember. So all of a sudden, he comes up with a new answer. How many times at his deposition last year did he say he had no explanation for something? And then, he comes before you folks, and all of a sudden, he has an explanation. So that's just the general background.

Let's look at some of the specific things. He told us that he actually saw Mr. Marshall in possession of the firearm. Really? It's not what you said at your deposition. At your deposition, you said you didn't see him in possession of a firearm. And just so there's no doubt about it, let's read the actual question and answer. This is on Page 58, Line 20. "QUESTION: You never saw the object in Mr. Marshall's actual, physical possession, correct?

JUDI JOHNSON, RPR, CRR, CLR - Official Court Reporter

A1206

1

2

3

10

11

12

13

18

20

22

23

24

PROCEEDINGS 73 1 "ANSWER: That is correct." 1 2 Well, what part of that is unclear? He was asked 3 point blank whether he ever saw it in his physical possession, 4 and he said no. He agreed it was correct. Now, if he never 5 saw this object in the physical possession of Mr. Marshall, 6 why did he swear under oath to a grand jury that he did see 7 it? I mean, those two stories aren't true; either you saw it, 8 or you didn't. Why did he tell the district attorney that he 9 saw this gun in the actual possession of Mr. Marshall? 9 10 10 He said those things. And then, he changes his 11 testimony during the course of these proceedings. It's 11 12 dishonest. The truth came out at his deposition. He never 12 13 actually saw the possession. How else do we know that? Think3 about some of the statements that he made to other people. 14 15 Remember, folks, when I was asking him, I said, "Did you malle a statement to another prosecuting attorney that you never space him in possession of a gun?" 17 18 "What, who, what prosecuting attorney? Who are vol 19 talking of?" 20 I said, "The prosecutor, Judy Phillips; did you make 20 21 a statement to her? Didn't vou tell Ms. Phillips that vou did 21 22 not see that gun in his possession? Didn't you tell her 23 that?" 23 24 "I never said that." 24 Then, I show him a document. And I said, "Sir, doe 25 25

PROCEEDINGS that refresh your memory that you told Ms. Phillips that you never saw this gun in his possession?"

"No, it doesn't refresh my memory. I never said that."

Well, of course, he can't admit saying it. If he admits he told prosecutor number two that he didn't see the gun in Marshall's possession, then what he told prosecutor number one was a lie. What he told the grand jury was a lie So he can't admit that he made that statement.

And then, I asked him, I said, "Sir, didn't you also make a statement to the gun enhancement unit, your fellow colleagues at the NYPD? Didn't you tell them you didn't see this gun in his possession?"

"I never said that."

I said, "Well, that's funny. That's not what you said at your deposition."

At your deposition, you said, "Actually, it's possible I did say that. I can't really remember."

Now, how is it possible, if he's saying these things now, he comes in here and he says that Marshall was in possession of a gun, and yet, at his deposition, he said that he wasn't. He tells this prosecutor, the second prosecutor, he wasn't. And he tells the gun enhancement unit he wasn't. Three different times, he said he wasn't. But you're supposed to believe, the one time that he told the first D.A., that

JUDI JOHNSON, RPR, CRR, CLR - Official Court Reporter

PROCEEDINGS 75

JUDI JOHNSON, RPR, CRR, CLR - Official Court Reporter

that's the true statement.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

This whole case, it's about credibility. Your job -- I told you this in opening statement - it requires the highest level of concentration to put together the pieces. This isn't going to be easy. You have to work through this evidence logically, think about these things. Why something on such a critical fact, how does that change over time?

What's the next thing that he says? The next thing he tells you, he tells you that he saw Marshall pull out the gun. He saw him pull out the object from his waist. That's funny. That's not what you said at your deposition, Officer. At your deposition, you said you didn't see any object pulled out of his waist.

And again, don't rely on what I'm telling you. 14 Let's look at the actual evidence. This is on Page 33 of this 15 man's deposition under oath. "QUESTION: The object that **∮**6u saw him pull out of his pants?

"ANSWER: I didn't see the object as he pulled it out of his pants."

So if you didn't see the object as he pulled it out of his pants, why did you tell the grand jury under oath that 21 you saw him pull a firearm out of his pants? That's a lie. He lied. Now, you folks have the power. You can just look the other way. And you can let him say it doesn't matter, these things happen, or you can hold him accountable. He's in 25

JUDI JUHNSON, RPR, CRR, CLR - Official Court Reporter

a court of law. What he told that grand jury is a lie. And the truth only came out when we started this civil lawsuit under oath.

PROCEEDINGS

What's the next thing he says? He says he actually saw with his own eyes -- he's certain about this, too, there's no mistake. He saw Marshall actually toss the gun away. Sure you did, Officer, just like you saw Mr. Marshall's eyes bulging from 150 feet away across the street in the dark, right? Let's think about it. What actually did this man see? He's sitting in the back seat of a car. He's got a driver in front of him, he's got a passenger in front of him. He's up to 25 feet away. And Marshall's back is towards him. How exactly is he seeing this?

Of course, it doesn't make sense. That's why they have to change the story ever so slightly. The story is changed so that there's an angle and Marshall kind of twists, Does that make sense? He's going to twist. Marshall's trying to throw the gun away and hide it because he sees the police coming. But here, Officer, look what I have, a gun. I'm throwing it into the street. Does that make sense? You have to use your common sense here. So much of this case is thinking through the evidence and using logic and deductive reasoning to work through it and figure out what's true and what's not true. His whole story doesn't make sense.

But what's even more telling, look at the paperwork.

A1207

1

2

8

10

11

12

13

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

77 **PROCEEDINGS** This man's the arresting officer. Now, he said at his deposition he has no idea why he's the arresting officer. To this day, he had no idea. But he's the arresting officer. Look at his arrest paperwork. He gives a version, he fills out the form. There's a section on the form that actually is a box called "DETAILS." I said, "Officer, you agree that the 6 detail of pulling out the gun in the waist; that's an important fact?" And he agreed, "Yes, that's important." "In fact, it's very important, right?" "Yes, it's very important." "But why isn't it anywhere in your report?" Now, in his deposition, he said "no particular

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

Q

10

11 12

13

14

15

16 17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1

2

3

5

6

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21 22

23

24

25

reason," but now he came into you, because he has to explain 14 it. It's going to look foolish, right? How is he going to explain this? He explains, "Actually, we don't really fill out that section. You know, we just kind of pass it on to the D.A."

Really? Then why is there a section that says "DETAILS" in large, capital letters? Why is it on the police report if you don't fill it out? These are the most important details of the entire case, that you saw him pull out the gun and toss it. And you didn't put that on your report?

I'll tell you why he didn't put it on the report, because at that point in time, he didn't have the details.

JUDI JOHNSON, RPR, CRR, CLR - Official Court Reporter

78 **PROCEEDINGS**

They hadn't quite come up with exactly how they were going to present this story. He didn't have those details. So that section of the report's blank. I asked him also, "What about the complaint report? You didn't mention anything on the complaint report, did you?"

"Hey, don't blame me. That's not my complaint report. You know, we all worked on that together. I didn't write it."

Actually, you did write it. That's what you said in your deposition. I said, "Who prepared this report?"

"I did." He prepared the complaint report. Then, he starts telling me, "Well, you see, it's so busy. We have all these documents we have to fill out and all these reports. We all have to help each other out."

Really? What other documents? We've seen these documents generated; an arrest report, complaint report and memo book entry. It's not like they didn't have enough time The man got six hours of overtime. He filled out a report. He just doesn't want to own it because it makes him look bad because there's no explanation for why he didn't have those details in.

But my personal favorite, the best one, was the last one in the memo book entry. Does anyone here remember what this man said at his deposition? He said he didn't know what a memo book entry was for. This is an officer who's been on

JUDI JOHNSON, RPR. CRR, CLR - Official Court Reporter

PROCEEDINGS

the force for eight years. Eight years, testifying under oath in a deposition that he doesn't know what he's supposed to db 2 with a memo book. Come on, are you folks buying this? Are you going to buy this? There's no way this man is telling the truth in this case. It's one false, phony, dishonest claim after another.

You can just look the other way and let it go if you want, or you can hold him accountable. In our system, when 8 you testify under oath, it's serious business. This isn't just playing fast and loose with the facts, change the story 10 if you don't like your answer last year at the deposition. 11 Just come in here. The jury won't know. They weren't there. 12 Come on, you folks know this. This is not right what he did. 13

And you go beyond and you look at the other witness 14 that we heard from, Officer Burbridge. Do you realize that 15 this man told two completely different stories? When he 16 appeared before the grand jury, one story. When he appeared 7 in the civil lawsuit, another story. 18

Let's look at story number one. This is what he was 19 telling to the grand jury. He testified under oath in front 20 of that grand jury that what happened was he had this 21 conversation with Marshall that he said, "Sir, can I talk to 22 you for a minute?" And then, what he did was he stepped out23 of his car in front of Marshall, and that's when Marshall 24 25 threw the gun.

PROCEEDINGS

So what he was selling to that grand jury, he was trying to make it sound like, man, I had this guy in my line of vision. He's standing there right in front of me. I saw the whole thing. Then, all of a sudden, actually, come to think of it, I wasn't standing in front of him on the sidewalk. That never happened. Actually, come to think of it, I was inside of a car 10 feet away still inside the car when he threw the gun.

Well, which is it? First, this isn't a game you can play with somebody's liberty and make up stories. How could a story change so dramatically? This man's not taking this at all seriously, understanding that when he testified in front of the grand jury, he's under oath to tell the truth.

And his paperwork is also an illustration of how the false and dishonest claims come in. Remember his form he filled out, his stop-and-frisk form? That form, he said, "I observed furtive movements before we made the stop." Actually, that's not what you said in your deposition. At your deposition, you said you didn't observe anything suspicious.

And here's what he said, Page 66: "QUESTION: Did you observe any furtive movements by Joshua Marshall before you decided to stop him?

"ANSWER: No."

So if the answer to that is no, why did you lie in

JUDI JOHNSON, RPR, CRR, CLR - Official Court Reporter

Case: 12-2479 Document: 40-1 Page: 14 09/27/2012 731928

A1208

4

5

10

12

13

14

15

23

24

25

1

2

4

8

10

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

24

25

PROCEEDINGS your report so you could make it seem like you saw something 1 suspicious? Why?

Now, ladies and gentlemen, the other thing is it's not just that these officers have conflicted their own testimony, not just that they change their stories from last year, but there are two stories. Each time they tell it, there's conflicts between the two of them that make no sense For example, they supposedly saw Marshall trying to make movements in relation to where Meade was standing. One version, he's going forward. He's trying to go forward. Meade stops, but he continues walking. Version number two, 11

1

2 3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

17

18

19

20

21

24

actually, he's going backwards. Well, which is it? Why is Officer Randall telling you one thing and Officer Burbridge telling you another? I'll tell you why, because it never happened. The truth is easy to remember. The truth is easy to 16 remember. If you see something happening, why is it that the 17 can't remember? More importantly, the most basic details +

these officers are trained to make observations. That's what 19 they told you, right? Why can't they tell the most basic thing? If you saw Marshall actually remove the gun, which was it? Was it his right hand? Did he pull it out with his right hand and throw it like that, or was it his left hand? Sorry,

Counselor, can't really help you with that one. Was it the

right side of his waist, the middle, or the left? Sorry, I

JUDI JOHNSON, KPR, CRR, CLR - Official Court Reporter

don't remember that. They don't remember it because they never saw it. The whole thing, the only thing they saw is something ahead of them, 25 feet. They never saw what they claim they saw.

PROCEEDINGS

Now, you heard this morning about the forensic evidence. We'll talk about that in one second or shortly. One thing I want to point out, you might have missed it during the trial, but there is a moment in this trial where this officer, the arresting officer, the critical question: Did he, himself, ask for any type of prints to be recovered? At his deposition, he said yes, "Yes, I did." Actually, no, you didn't. If you look at the complaint report that he prepared, there's a special box that says "prints requested," yes or no. He checked that box off "no" two times. Now, when he comes to court, he admits for the first time ever that he actually never requested fingerprints.

Now, again, using your logic as jurors, using your intellect, what possible explanation would there be for why the arresting officer would not request fingerprint analysis? Why? Why wouldn't you do that? This is like the most routine police procedure. He told you his supervisor had instructed him that it should be done on every case. Why, on this particular case, did he decide not to? Because the last thing he wanted was to actually get the fingerprint analysis. It's the last thing he wanted. Because there's a very good chance

JUDI JOHNSON, RPR, CRR, CLR - Official Court Reporter

PROCEEDINGS 83

he knows it wasn't going to be Marshall's prints on there.

You heard about this on the forensic evidence this morning. Here's what I get out of it. When they actually tested this gun, first with the New York City Police Department, the entire harrel, they never bothered taking a swab. Now, here's a gun toss case. Somebody's taking a gun 6 and throwing it. You don't take a swab of this part of the gun? There's six bullets inside there. You don't test any of those bullets.

And then, the kicker of all, they actually have a sample right now. All along, they were claiming there wasn't 11 a sample big enough to be tested. Actually, they have a sample. It's been sitting there all along, the entire four years of this lawsuit. If they really believed Marshall had this gun, why didn't they test it? Just prove it. That would blow this case out of the water, wouldn't it? If Marshall's DNA is on that gun, the case is over.

But instead, what do they do? They wait until the week before trial when they first call in these witnesses to try to get their defense together here. Why didn't they call these DNA people a few years ago, and say, listen, we have 22 this case going on. We want to show this man was in possession of the gun. Why didn't they do that? They told you this morning that the higher-sensitivity test can be done The sample's still sitting there as we speak. Why wasn't it

PROCEEDINGS

84

done?

Now, up to this point what I've covered, I've covered with you the changing stories of these different officers. I've covered with you the things that are missing in the police reports. I've covered with you the forensic evidence or lack thereof. They can come up with all the excuses they want. The bottom line is there is absolutely no physical evidence connecting this man to this crime. That's what we've covered so far.

But there's one other area I just want to cover with you, an area of just plain, common sense reasoning about their story. I want you to think about it for a minute. Think if this sounds logical. We have a police car pulling up to Mr. Marshall. And the police said, "Can we have a moment of your time?" Marshall, at that moment in time while the officer is standing there, that's when he chooses to take the gun out. But wait a minute. Marshall told you on the stand here that Meade was walking there. He said the cops are coming. Marshall acknowledged that he was aware of the police car coming down the street. Why on earth would he wait until the police car is right there and say okay, now's a good time?

The police car comes up to him, "Can I have a moment of your time?" Sure, Officer, just one minute please. Let me just take this gun out and throw it. Okay, yeah. What would you like, Officer? Does that sound right? Does that make

JUDI JOHNSON, RPR, CRR, CLR - Official Court Reporter

Case: 12-2479 Document: 40-1 Page: 15 09/27/2012 731928

A1209

4

11

12

13

15

16

17

18

19

1

PROCEEDINGS

logical sense? He's going to wait until the cop car is right there. If he knew the cop car was coming, wouldn't he have been just tossing it away before they came?

1

2

3

4

5

7

8

9

10 11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18 19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

The other thing that doesn't make sense, which we touched on a little bit on earlier, why on earth would he be turning around to face the officers? First of all, if you're trying to conceal that you have a gun, why are you turning a all? You're trying to do it in this direction. But more importantly, if you were turning around and take out a gun, you know that's pretty dangerous. You'll be shot on sight by a police officer if that happened, if an officer sees somebody coming out, turning with a gun.

I'm only pointing out to you, as I've tried to throughout the trial, logic and common sense. It doesn't maked4 sense. Their story doesn't make sense. Why doesn't it make sense? It's a fabrication. They didn't really think it through clearly. They just came up with their story, and they're stuck with it. That's why it doesn't make sense. It's illogical. It could not have happened that way.

And so when you put it all together -- and this is 20 what I am asking you to do. I'm not asking you to make any 21 quick decisions. I want you to think through carefully, but 22 23 put together the changing statements. Put together the omissions in the reports. Put together the complete lack of 24 forensic evidence. And then, use your common sense and sed. 25

JUDI JOHNSON, RPR, CRR, CLR - Official Court Reporter

86 **PROCEEDINGS**

Put it all together.

And then, you start to understand why this case got dismissed in May of 2009. Think about it, ladies and gentlemen. This should've been an open-and-shut case. You have two police officers swearing under oath that they saw this man move a gun. What else is there to decide? And yet this case is thrown out. Why? Because they have massive credibility problems; because the arresting officer keeps changing his story over and over again; because his partner keeps changing his story over and over again; because they know there's no way this case could be presented to a jury at trial. This case just fell apart at the seams because of all these credibility issues.

Now, what really happened here? What really happened? I'll tell you what happened. It's exactly as you heard it from Mr. Marshall. Meade saw the cop car coming first. Meade's the one that panicked. He's the one that said he's got to just get near his buddy and ditch the gun so the cops wouldn't know. And you know what, folks? It worked perfectly. He got off the hook and Marshall did his time. Marshall did four and a half months in a jail for a crime he didn't commit. It was Meade's gun.

Now, if you folks were to say well, we understand maybe the officers were mistaken, that's not a possibility in this case. They've repeatedly sworn under oath that they saw

JUDI JOHNSON, RPR, CRR, CLR - Official Court Reporter

PROCEEDINGS

Marshall with a gun. If they just owned it at the beginning and just admitted the truth, that the truth is they did not see what happened. They got there split seconds too late, three or four seconds too late. All they heard was the gun. That's why both men were thrown against the wall; that's why5 both men were handcuffed; that's why they had to have their little meeting to decide what to do.

And this nonsense that otherwise, they would just take two people in and interrogate them, what a bunch of nonsense. If they took both of those people in, what would 10 happen is they would have to admit they didn't actually see 11 who threw the gun, case over. So they just made a spot 12 decision, 50/50, odds are it's one of them. Anyway, what are 13 they doing out here? They just made a judgment. They were 14 judge and jury right on the scene, and took this man's liberty 15 away. 16

If they just owned it, if they were honest and just 17 told the truth, this wouldn't have happened. The truth would 18 be going to the prosecutors and saying we heard the gun. We 19 got there split seconds later. We believe it's this guy, but we're not sure. We need to do further evaluation. That 21 would've been the honest thing to do. Instead, they took this 22 man's liberty away and threw him in jail. And he rotted there3 for four and a half months in the summer of 2008 for nothing,24 because he didn't do this crime.

PROCEEDINGS

This man's innocent. He didn't do this crime. It's Meade's gun. And all we're asking you to do is hold these officers accountable. They knew what they were doing, but they didn't lose any sleep over it. You know why? They figured the ends justified the means. You know what? We got the gun off the street, great. The problem with that argument is you got the wrong person. The person who actually had the gun is going home that night. And Lord knows, he probably has another gun and will be out on the street the next day. The guy who was actually innocent is the one that does the time for it. It's wrong. The whole thing's wrong.

The last thing I want to cover with you and -- two last items I want to cover with you, and I'll conclude. The defense in this case; what have we learned about the defense here? We have learned here that approximately four years after this incident, just last week, the defense attorneys in this case decided actually, you know what, we're going to trial. We better reach out to some witnesses and help bolste the claims here. You know why? They did that because they knew they have big problems in this case. They knew that if they just rely on Randall and Burbridge, they're going down

So what do they do? First, they call Officer Fox, the star witness for the defense, the guy who's going to clean up the whole mess and just make it all good again, right? What is this man who they never even called this guy for four

A1210

4

5

13

17

18

19

20

21

24

89 **PROCEEDINGS** years? No one ever talked to him. This man was so unimportant that the D.A.'s office never interviewed him, let alone him testifying in front of a grand jury. And this guy, he comes in here. What's the one thing, the one undisputed fact we get out of him? He didn't see who threw the gun. He 5 did not see who threw the gun. That's the number one fact, and with good reason.

1

2

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14 15

16

17

18

19

20

21

23

24

25

1

2

3

4

5

6

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

The man's driving the wrong way down a one-way street at night in an area where you have several stores that are open 24 hours, and of course he's paying attention to what's ahead of him. He's not looking. What did he actually 11 remember? This man said he did thousands of arrests, over a12 thousand in his career. And yet, four years later, he's 13 contacted for the first time. And wouldn't you know it, he just remembers in great detail this particular case. Of 15 course, it comes out that his memory was somewhat refreshed 16 when he was able to meet with the lawyers from the Defendants in this case.

And we're seeing what happens here. We saw an 19 example with Officer Burbridge. Remember, I questioned him 20 yesterday about this. During his deposition, Officer 21 Burbridge couldn't think of the right answer. We had a break, and all of a sudden, the answers came flowing. We saw how 23 Officer Randall was only too happy to adopt the term, his 24 "associate." He started using that in his direct after hearing 25

JUDI JOHNSON, RPR, CRR, CLR - Official Court Reporter

PROCEEDINGS

it from the lawyer. My point is this: How real is that testimony? It's four years after the fact meeting with their lawyers. And at the end of the day, it really doesn't change any of the dynamics in this case at all.

The one part, I don't know if you believe it, I don't think this guy actually saw anything. Even if you believed his story they saw Meade's hands, that just would make perfect sense to this whole story of what happened. Meade is going along. He's the one that tosses the gun. He's the one worried about the cops. Officers, look, I got nothing here. What normal person would walk down the street, and when police are coming, would go like this? That doesn't make sense. He's doing it because he's got the guilty conscience. He knows he just tossed that gun. He wants to make sure the officers think it's not him. And guess what? It worked. It worked.

The bottom line is this, ladies and gentlemen. Your questions are going to come down to what they call a verdict sheet. I'm just going to walk through this very briefly with you. You'll get it again. You're going to have copies of it. You'll have a chance to go through this extensively. Essentially, there are three main questions: Was Mr. Marshall falsely arrested by these two Defendants; was he maliciously prosecuted; was he denied a right to a fair trial by the false evidence?

JUDI JOHNSON, RPR, CRR, CLR - Official Court Reporter

PROCEEDINGS

Now, I suggest to you all of those questions turn on the very first thing that we talked about when I started my closing argument today: Did Marshall have a gun on him? **ff** 3 Marshall did not have gun on him, if the answer to that question is no, he did not have a gun, then the answer to all of the questions on the verdict sheet is yes. Now, if Marshall actually had the gun, if you still believe that after everything you've heard, then of course, he's not entitled to anything. You throw him out. That's your job as jurors.

But if you actually think through this and believe 10 that these officers gave false information to the prosecutors, 11 they duped the prosecutors because the prosecutors weren't od? on the street. They duped it and put it over on the grand jury with these false stories. If you believe that's what 14 happened, then the Marshall to not having a gun, the answer the all the answers on the verdict sheet is yes. It's yes. 16

And then, you'll see there's a question. When they're talking about maliciously prosecuting, just so you understand, our view is simply this: They're feeding false information. They may not be the prosecutors, per se, but they're feeding that information. Now, one thing on the first two questions on false arrest. Let's say some of you -- and I know there's room for a healthy discussion about all this case 23 and the facts. It's not like the attorneys --

MS. CASTRO: Objection.

PROCEEDINGS

92

THE COURT: You may continue your argument. MR. NORINSBERG: -- defense counsel got up in your opening and said this is just an open-and-shut case. We actually want you to think about it. When you think about it, let's say some of you still are not sure. You don't know where you are. The first questions, the first two questions on false arrest, the Defendants actually have the burden of proof on those questions. You'll hear that from the judge. They have the burden to prove that they had grounds to arrest Marshall, not us. We have the burden on the other two claims. But on those first two questions, for some of you, if you're not comfortable with that, they have the burden. If they fail to meet their burden, they lose on that claim.

Now, you'll see the sections on compensatory damages, I don't even want to touch that with you. I want this case -- I don't want to taint this about this case being a money case. This is about holding these officers accountable. Whatever value you put on it is fine. It's about showing that you were not fooled like these other people. You weren't mislead like the grand jury. You see the light here. You understand what happened.

But there's one section, the last section on punitive damages, that I do want you to take very seriously. Punitive damages gives you an opportunity to speak your voice |and actually be heard as a juror. You can send a message to

JUDI JOHNSON, RPR, CRR, CLR - Official Court Reporter

A1211

	PROCEEDINGS 93		PROCEEDINGS 94
1	these two Defendants.	1	a quarter after one. Don't discuss the case.
2	MS. CASTRO: Objection.	2	(The jury exited.)
3	MR. NORINSBERG: You can send a message.	3	THE COURT: You have the jury charge with all the
4	THE COURT: You may continue your argument.	4	corrections. And we've run off copies for the jury later.
5	MR. NORINSBERG: You can send a message thr	ough	Monjoy your lunch. I'll see you at 1:15.
6	verdict, not just to these two Defendants, but to any other	6	(A lunch recess was taken.)
7	police officer out there that thinks it's okay to get in front	7	(Continued on the next page.)
8	of a grand jury and lie. You can send a message to any	8	
9	other police officer out there that thinks it's okay.	9	
10	THE COURT: Strike that reference to before the	10	
1	grand jury.	11	
2	MR. NORINSBERG: You can send a message to	n i y2o1	ther
3	police officer that thinks it's okay to tell a prosecutor	13	
4	something that's completely false, and say, you know what, y	o u 4	
5	can't do that. You actually cannot do that in our system.	15	
6	You will be accountable. And that's what we're going to ask	16	
7	you to do at the end of the day is listen to all of the	17	
8	evidence, work through it carefully. But if you do that and	18	
9	you honor the pledges you made in your jury selection, you'r	e 19	
0.0	going to get the right result, and that's to hold these two	20	
1	Defendants responsible for putting this man in jail for four	21	
2	and a half months. Thank you.	22	
3	THE COURT: Thank you. Lunch will be up at 12	: 3 6.	
24	Do you want to take a break now, and then get back here at	24	
25	about quarter after one, take a break now? We'll continue a	t 25	
	JUDI JUHNSON, RPR, CRR, CLR - Official Court Rep	orter	JUDI JOHNSON, RPR, CRR, CLR - Official Court Report

1

2

3

4

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

22

23

95 **PROCEEDINGS** 1 2 (Honorable Jack B. Weinstein takes the bench.) 3 (Jury is in the courtroom at 1:20 p.m.) 4 THE COURT: Be seated, please. Proceed. 5 CLOSING STATEMENT BY THE DEFENSE 6 MS. CASTRO: Good afternoon, ladies and gentlemen. 7 JURORS: Good afternoon. 8 MS. CASTRO: I want to start off by thanking you for 9 your careful attention that you paid throughout the course of 10 this trial. On behalf of my client, Police Officers Michael 11 Burbridge and Salim Randall, as well as my co-counsel, we 12 would like to thank you for the careful attention that you 13 will also give to your deliberations in deciding this case. 14 Now, I do have some remarks that I want to go 15 through and discuss our case, but I want to start off by 16 addressing some of the points that were made by plaintiff's 17 counsel in his summation a little while ago. 18 Now, first off, with respect to Officer Randall, 19 plaintiff's counsel started off by trying to attack his 20 credibility. He wanted you to believe that he's not a 21 credible witness and he gave you a few reasons for that. One 21 22 of the first reasons he gave you is because he says that there 23 are inconsistencies in his testimony. 24 Now, as plaintiff's counsel went through and told 25 you repeatedly, this happened four years ago. Four years ago 25 MARY AGNES DRURY, RPR - Official Court Reporter

is a long time to remember every single detail of what occurred. However, the evidence has shown that Officer Randall is consistent in the important facts of this case. He knows what he saw and he knows what he heard. He knows that he saw the plaintiff pull an object out of his waistband, make a pitching motion, and he tossed it. He knows that he heard the sound of the metal cling on the ground. He said that that is the most unmistakable sound that he knows for a fact that that's the sound of a gun hitting the ground. He's been consistent throughout his testimony in saying that. Now, the second reason he wants to attack Officer

Randall's credibility is because of his paperwork, his arrest paperwork, to be specific. And he spent a lot of time harping on the detail section of the arrest report. He wants you to believe that that section was left blank, that was his word, that was counsel's word, that he left that section blank, that he didn't put any information about what happened.

Now, he didn't show you that paperwork during summation, but it was admitted into evidence and you're going to have a chance to review it. Now, that arrest report is Plaintiff's Exhibit 6. And the detail section, if you look at it, says at TPO, which is time, place of occurrence, above defendant named Joshua Marshall was found in the possession of a loaded firearm, and it even specifies a serial number. That's not blank. That's a play on his words. And it's a

MARY AGNES DRURY, RPR - Official Court Reporter

731928 Case: 12-2479 Document: 40-1 Page: 18 09/27/2012

A1212

1

2

play of words that's happened throughout the course of this testimony.

1

2

3

4

5

6 7

8 9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18 19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

You were here when you heard the testimony of 3 Officer Randall, when he was questioned by plaintiff's 4 counsel. Mr. Norinsberg stood right there and he asked him multiple questions and he tried to impeach him using his prior6 testimony. And a specific example of that attempt to impeach 7 is when he asked him whether it was dark when it was dark that night and Officer Randall answered that it was.

10 Now, the testimony that he gave was consistent. However, counsel skipped some of the questions in his 11 deposition to make it seem as if he was being inconsistent. 12 And the specific questions that were asked. Question: Was [t13] dark out at that time? Answer, yes. The next question that 14 he skipped and had to be corrected to include: Was there wert5 any lights on, on the street? Answer: Yes. Question: Where16 was the closest lights from where Mr. Marshall was standing?17 Answer: I can't recall. And then he skipped the question: Were there any lights on the street where the answer was "yes 9 to make it seem as if it was dark and that he couldn't recall that there were any streetlights close to where the plaintiff 21 was standing. 22 23

That's just another tactic, another play on his words.

> Another play on his word goes to the memo. Now, \$25 MARY AGNES DRURY, RPR - Official Court Reporter

talked about how Officer Randall said at his deposition that he doesn't know what a memo book entry was for. Now, the memo book is in evidence; and again, you have a chance it look at it. But just to point out to you there is an entry for this incident and this is in evidence as Plaintiff's Exhibit Number 1. That memo book entry reads: 0045, which is 12:45 a.m. Marshall, Joshua placed under arrest for CPW, means

He knows what a memo book entry is for. He's got the information right here. This is another play on his words.

criminal possession of a weapon in the second degree.

Now, he talked a lot about the fingerprint request and how that request was not made on the complaint report filled out by Officer Randall. Now, we've heard testimony first in the opening, beginning with plaintiff's opening that there was fingerprint testing done. So what's the big deal? The big deal is that it is a play of his words. He wants you to think that Officer Randall didn't do his job, that Officer Randall didn't fill out the paperwork, he wants you to think that Officer Randall was hiding something, but the fact is this morning you heard from Police Officer Sena from the evidence collection team. He told you he got a request to do the fingerprint check and he did do that check. Another play of words from the plaintiff.

> There's another document in evidence that's of MARY AGNES DRURY, RPR - Official Court Reporter

significance, because plaintiff's counsel has harped on the fact that nowhere in the paperwork did the officers note that this man had a gun and that he tossed it. That isn't -- that is in the paperwork. And again, it's a document that you can 4 look at, it's in evidence, Plaintiff's Exhibit 11. It's the UF-250 report. He showed you this document but he didn't point out this important fact. What did he point out? He pointed out that Officer Burbridge checked off that they referred to movement. What he didn't point out to you is in the handwriting, and what it says is that the plaintiff was observed throwing a firearm to the ground. That's an important detail that he skipped.

Now, plaintiff's counsel also wants you to think that inconsistencies in the testimony means that officers are lying. Again, it happened four years ago and the defendants have maintained their testimony is consistent.

(There was a brief interruption - a juror was coughing)

MS. CASTRO: Now, counsel spent a good amount of 9 time talking about the fact that he thinks the defendants' story doesn't make sense. I'm going to tell you whose story 21 makes no sense, the person whose story makes no sense is the 22 person in this room who is lying, is the plaintiff. His story 23 makes absolutely no sense. And there's many different parts 24 of the story that we can break down and look at how it makes 25

MARY AGNES DRUKY, RPR - Official Court Reporter

no sense.

24

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

First off, let's start off by talking about the associate. He's walking down the street with the associate, and they told you that he parted ways. He also told you that for no reason at all the associate comes back and tells him, warns him police are coming. Well, the associate was the one carrying the gun. Why would he come back to where the police are coming? Why would he put himself in a position to get caught if he was carrying a gun? That makes no sense, but

What's the other part of the story that makes no sense? Well, he wants you to think that when the officers, you know, came upon the scene they ran out of the car and said, "whose gun is it? Whose gun is it?" First of all, there is no evidence that that question was asked. He's the only one that's telling you that the officers were saying whose gun is it. But if the officers don't know whose gun it was, Officer Burbridge told you what would happen in that situation; both of them would have been arrested. They would have been taken back to the station house and they would have been questioned.

Now, plaintiff's counsel said well, that's nonsense. But guess what, he's got no evidence to refute that. Nobody came here and said that's not how it works. That is how it works, that's the evidence. His story makes no sense.

MARY AGNES DRURY, RPR - Official Court Reporter

100

Case: 12-2479 Document: 40-1 Page: 19 09/27/2012 731928 126

A1213

Now, there are three things in this case and it is a simple case, as my co-counsel told you in the opening statement yesterday, it is a simple case. The story is about three officer from the Brooklyn North Anticrime Unit, they were on patrol and they see two men walking down the stree. 5 One of these men is observed pulling a gun from the waistbands and tossing it. That's the whole case. That's it. He was arrested because of that. That's the only reason why.

2.2

Plaintiff's first claim is the false arrest claim. Now, for this claim the only relevant question you have to answer is whether there was probable cause for this arrest. Probable cause, Judge Weinstein will instruct you, means that 2 there was a reasonable belief the officers believed that the plaintiff had or was committing a crime. You're going to receive a verdict sheet at the end of the summations and you're going to use this verdict sheet to inform us of your decision. For the first two questions of the verdict sheet 1-A and 1-B pertain to whether the officers falsely arrested the plaintiff on May 15, 2008. And we submit to you the evidence shows that the answer to these two questions should be "no."

Now, by now you've heard that the standard of proof22 in this case is different from a criminal case. In a criminal case the standard of proof is beyond a reasonable doubt to determine whether somebody's guilty or not guilty. You're no25

MARY AGNES DRURY, RPR - Official Court Reporter

here to do that. The standard of proof in this case is by a preponderance of the evidence. And what that means is that if you've got the scales of justice weighing the evidence that was presented by plaintiff and the defendant, that if the scale tips slightly in the favor of the defendant, then on this claim you must find for the defendant.

So with that in mind, let's talk about how the officers had probable cause. You heard testimony from the three officers who were out on parole on May 15, 2008. You heard that yesterday. What they told you is they observed the plaintiff remove an object from his waistband. Officer Burbridge told you that he specifically saw the plaintiff remove the gun. He tossed it. Officer Randall will tell you that he saw that movement from his vantage point, he saw the movement. He saw the pitch and then he heard the sound. The third officer, Officer Fox told you that he had his eye on the associate the whole time and the associate had his hands up before the sound of the gun hit on the ground. There's no doubt in the officers' minds that that's what they saw and that's what they heard, no doubt.

Now, the plaintiff wants to question whether the officers actually saw him throw this gun. We submit to you that the evidence is perfectly clear that they saw him with that gun, saw him throw that gun. They're not mistaken about that. It wasn't the associate's gun, it was his.

MARY AGNES DRURY, RPR - Official Court Reporter

Now, according to the plaintiff and only the plaintiff, the associate threw the gun and the officers said, whose gun is it? We saw no other evidence than his testimony.3 And it's your job to weigh the testimony and decide who's credible and who's not credible.

Officer Randall told you what he heard and what he 6 saw. Officer Burbridge told you what he saw and what he heard. Officer Fox told what you he saw and what he heard. There was no doubt in their mind that they saw that man with 9 the gun.

Now, following this arrest the plaintiff was taken to the 83rd precinct. And you heard from the plaintiff that on the ride back the officers even told him that they saw him with that gun. Once back at the precinct the paperwork was completed and the request for the fingerprints were made. We know that because Officer Sena told us that when he got or when his partner got in at 6 a.m. there was a message request that fingerprints were needed and they went to the precinct and they collected that gun and they fumed it for prints.

Ladies and gentlemen, we submit to you that because of the officers' observations and because of what they heard, 22 there was probable cause for that arrest. For that reason, we 23 ask you to check "no" on the two questions as to whether 24 Officer Burbridge and Officer Randall falsely arrested the

MARY AGNES DRURY, RPR - Official Court Reporter

plaintiff.

Now, plaintiff's second claim. And actually, before I get to that. There was one part in the plaintiff's summation that he left out entirely, and that crucial part that he left out is what's the motive? What's their reason for wanting to pin this gun on this man if they know that somebody else threw it? What's the reason for that? They can't give you a reason because there is no reason. None. There is no evidence of that. The only reason is because that's what they saw.

Let's talk about plaintiff's second claim, and that's the malicious prosecution claim. The first part that you need to decide to determine whether or not the officers maliciously prosecuted him is whether there was probable cause. And as I already explained to you, there was. There's no doubt they saw him take the gun from his waistband and throw it. And there's a second part to the malicious prosecution claim, and that goes to the timing of when the officers speak to the District Attorney's office. So the Judge is going to give you instructions about how to come up with your decision about this claim. But one of the instructions that he will tell you is that --

MR. NORINSBERG: Objection. We'd ask that all instructions be from the Court not from counsel.

THE COURT: You may continue.

MARY AGNES DRURY, RPR - Official Court Reporter

A1214

4

6

18

20

21

23

24

25

14

15

18

19

20

21

23

105

MS. CASTRO: One of the instructions that the Judge will give you is that the defendant cannot be held liable for what he says to the grand jury. He cannot be held liable to what he says to the prosecutor if it's not his preparation for a statement to the grand jury.

1

2

3 4

5

6

7

10

11

12 13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

1

4

5

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

Now, yesterday when you heard from Officer Burbridge, he told you he spoke to the prosecutor for five minutes in preparation of his grand jury testimony, and then 8 he went in and gave his testimony for the grand jury and had 9 no further involvement in the prosecution. That hasn't been 10 refuted. There's no evidence to say that didn't happen. For 11 that reason we ask you with respect to the plaintiff's malicious prosecution, which are going to be questions 2-A and3 2-B on your verdict sheet, 2-B pertains to Officer Burbridge, 14 we ask that you check off "no".

Let's talk about Officer Randall. Now, he did speak 16 to the prosecutor right after the arrest and he told the District Attorney's office the same thing that he told the grand jury and that he said at his deposition, and the same thing that he told you here. And what he said was that he observed the plaintiff remove the object from his waistband, toss it, and he heard the sound of the gun. There's no evidence to refute that that's what he said to the District Attorney. They didn't put on a witness from the District Attorney's office that says that that's not true. It's

MARY AGNES DRURY, RPR - Official Court Reporter

unrefuted.

And there's one more component to the malicious prosecution claim, and that component is malice. The plaintiff has the burden of showing that the officers acted with ill will with personal hostility to the plaintiff. As I told you before, there is no motive. There's no evidence that they had any ill will towards the plaintiff. There's no evidence that they disliked him. There's no evidence in this trial that they even knew him. There's no malice. For that reason we ask you to find that they did not maliciously prosecute him.

Now, you've heard from plaintiff as well yesterday that he told you that he voluntarily testified at the grand jury, and even after the grand jury heard his story, they still decided to indict him. They indicted him on three counts of criminal possession of a weapon.

Now, yesterday the Judge told you that just because the grand jury indicted him doesn't mean that he's guilty. And likewise, just because the criminal charges were dismissed in this case, that doesn't mean that the officers didn't see him toss that gun. That doesn't mean that the officers didn' have probable cause to arrest him. So again, for these reasons, we ask you to find the officers not liable for malicious prosecution.

> Now, as to plaintiff's third claim, he's claiming MARY AGNES DRURY, RPR - Official Court Reporter

that he was denied a fair right to a trial. Now, the Judge is going to tell you that the plaintiff must prove that the defendant knowingly created false evidence and presented that to the prosecutor, and that that evidence was a depravation of 4 his liberty.

However, if you believe that the defendants presented accurate information to the prosecutor or presented? inaccurate evidence without the requisite intent, then you must find for the defendants on this claim.

Now, again, ladies and gentlemen, the plaintiff has not and cannot show you that either of these officers made anyl 1 false evidence that led to the depravation of his liberty. They can't do that. There's no proof of that. 13

So now let's talk about the forensic evidence in this case. You heard from two individuals this morning that talked about fingerprints and DNA. Now, plaintiff's counsel would like you to believe because there was no DNA or fingerprint, that that must mean that the gun was not the plaintiff's or that he didn't handle the gun. That's incorrect. First of all, this isn't CSI, this isn't Law and Order, that is real life. And in real life, as you heard today, you don't always get forensic evidence and there are different reasons why. Starting with Officer Sena, he told you that he almost never gets fingerprint on a gun. And the reason for that is because the surfaces of the gun. Here, the 25

MARY AGNES DRURY, RPR - Official Court Reporter

handle of the gun was brutish, very difficult to get a fingerprint. Not just plaintiff's fingerprint, there weren't fingerprints of the officers. No prints. That doesn't mean he didn't handle that gun.

You also heard from a criminalist from the medical examiner's office. Now, she told you that the swabs of the DNA were tested -- well. They couldn't test them, because there was an insufficient sample. That didn't mean what plaintiff wants you to believe. And again, that's a play of his words. What that means is because there was not enoug evidence, not enough DNA for them to test, not enough DNA to match him; but again, that doesn't mean he didn't handle that gun, it doesn't mean that the officers didn't see him toss that gun.

One of the things that plaintiffs had in summation was that the defense or the prosecutors, they didn't test the sample that you heard is still in the lab. Well, guess what, they could have asked for that test and they didn't either. So it's a play of his word.

Now, ladies and gentlemen, when you retire to your deliberations, keep in mind there's only one person here who has motive, motive to lie. That's that man right there. What's his motive? He wants money. He wants you to give him money. Think about that when you are deliberating.

Now, this is going to be my last opportunity to

MARY AGNES DRURY, RPR - Official Court Reporter

108

106

Case: 12-2479 Document: 40-1 Page: 21 09/27/2012 731928 126

A1215

speak with you. After I sit down you'll hear from the plaintiff's counsel and he'll get to tell you his last word, he'll try to refute what I told you, but I want you to carefully consider the evidence and come to your own conclusion. Who do you believe?

Thank you again for your time and attention. We hope that you find in favor of the defendants, Police Officers 7 Salim Randall and Michael Burbridge. Thank you very much8

THE JURORS: Thank you.

THE COURT: Thank you.

CLOSING REBUTTAL STATEMENT BY THE PLAINTIFF11

MR. NORINSBERG: Folks, you're almost done. almost there. I have a few brief remarks, just a few points I want to hit on and then we'll turn it to the Judge to give you instructions of law.

A few things here. This notion that it happened four years ago and that's why Officer Randall can't remembed?

Come on, folks, he testified just last year, the inconsistencies are what he testified to a year ago and today, so I think that's not a reasonable argument at all. We're not talking about what he couldn't remember four years ago, it's changing what he said last year to this year.

The reports, the key issue on the reports is simply this: The important fact of seeing the gun move and throwing the critical words are nowhere in the arresting officer's 25

MARY AGNES DRURY, RPR - Official Court Reporter

report. So there is a bit of a subterfuge to sort of -- if you can talk about other things, that's what the issue is in this case. If he actually saw these things, they weren't in the report.

This notion about motive and reason, let me just address this. First, the Judge is going to instruct you that in terms of malice, the mere fact, if you find as jurors that the officers lack probable cause, you can infer malice. You don't have to think that they were out to get this guy. Just the fact that they lacked probable cause is sufficient to conclude malice.

And what happened in terms of what happened here? These officers had an indifference, it didn't matter about what happened here, it's not that they're out to get one of these guys or the other, it's much more the fact that you have two men on the street, one of them must have this gun, and we'll get one of them and the other one is probably up to no good anyway. The fact that Mr. Marshall is staying at his aunt's house on that street, they're not aware of that, they don't care about that, it's indifferent. The malice can infer from the lack of probable cause, the Judge will tell you that.

Now, this idea that the plaintiffs could have tested the DNA. You heard this and it came at a subtle point, but an important point that the report was just written this past week. The report never mentioned the fact that there was

MARY AGNES DRURY, RPR - Official Court Reporter

still an extract. The first time that any of us hear that today is from this witness. That's the first time we learned they actually had an extract. All along they claimed that there was an insufficient amount. In fact, the first time we hear about it is today.

If they truly believed this man was in possession of that gun, why on earth didn't they have that extract tested? They have the ability. It's just -- all the witness said was that it's not with our standard protocols, it's not enough, but they have higher sensitivity testing. They had four years to do this, folks, why wouldn't they do it? Why wasn't it done?

Now, you also were told about the meet — whether or 13 not there was discussions with the District Attorney. Here's a very important piece of evidence you have in there, there's a complaint, an actual criminal complaint. And if you remember Officer Randall on the stand, I actually showed him!? that complaint and I said, did you make the statement in this complaint, did you tell the District Attorney this? And he said yes. And that's why it's in evidence, so you can take a look at that and see.

Now, with respect to the grand jury. Yes, we know the grand jury has indicted, that was something we talked about in opening statement. The real question is why did the y24 indict? They indicted because they were told something that 25

MARY AGNES DRURY, RPR - Official Court Reporter

turned out to be completely different. They were told by Officer Burbridge that he was actually standing in front and seeing this man throw a gun. Of course they are going to believe that. Understand the fact that when you heard it from Mr. Marshall, he's not allowed to ask him questions, the only person questioning in that room is the prosecutor. But when the truth came out; you, as jurors, heard much more than they ever heard, and you know much more, and I think you're in a better position to make a decision on this case.

You also heard some reference to what Officer Senadid in the testing, the fingerprint testing. But again, we learned for the first time today, now, that this is the first time in the four years that he said that he didn't actually test the bullets, and why did he not test the bullets, what did he say? He told us, well, this was a possession case, so we only test the gun. But who put the bullets in the gun? Logically, wouldn't that be the thing that you do? Some human being did that. Whoever put the bullet in the gun had possession of the gun.

The thing I want to talk about, ladies and gentlemen, this incident happened four years ago. Four years have gone by. To this date these officers have never once been held accountable for what happened that night. Four years have gone by. They have never been held accountable for what they told the prosecutor for the statements they made,

MARY AGNES DRURY, RPR - Official Court Reporter

A1216

2

4

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

25

4

5

12

13

14

15

113

for the fact that that man spent four and a half months in jail. To this day the only panel that will ever have a chance to make that decision is you.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14 15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

25

And I understand that you have to listen to everything and consider all of the evidence, not just from one 5 side or the other, but all the evidence. But, ladies and gentlemen, what happened here, what happened to this family 7s it was not ripe. This was not his gun. This was not his gun and he wound up doing time for it. And if they had just been 9 honest about what happened, this never would have taken plade and he never would have done that time in jail. And I ask youl 1 please, when you are evaluating all the evidence, use your common sense, listen to the instructions that the Judge gives 13 you, listen to the fact that they are the ones that have to prove that they have legitimate grounds to arrest this man.

And I will tell you, ladies and gentlemen, if you do that at long last, you will hold these officers accountable. You are the final say. This is the last show. No one else will look at this. You are the ones that will make this decision. And I ask you to do the right thing here. Give this man justice. Do the right thing.

THE COURT: Okay. Thank you. Why don't you take five minutes and we'll just read you the charge. 23

(Jury is out of the courtroom at 1:53 p.m.) (Continued on the next page.)

JUDI JUHNSON, RPR, CRR, CLR - Official Court Reporter

PROCEEDINGS

114

(The jury entered.)

THE COURT: All right. Be seated, please.

You have those instructions. Read them along with me. Don't go to the end. I'm going to tell you what the law is, and you follow those instructions that I now give you. You will be able to take the instructions into the room where you're deliberating, and you will be able to have all the documents and blowups that were introduced in evidence and so much of the transcripts as you wish. They've ordered transcripts. So in some cases, we may actually send the transcript in, should you ask for portions of it. But try to be specific. We don't want to send in the whole trial, of course.

You're the judges of the facts. Neither the attorneys nor I can help you very much more than we've already tried to assist you. I have no view myself as to how the case will have to be decided, and nothing I've said or done should indicate to you that I have such a view.

Your verdict have to be based on the evidence that you heard here and saw. Put aside any personal feelings you may have about the parties, race, religion, national origin, ethnic background, gender, occupation, anything like that.

Don't do any research of your own and decide on what 24 you've heard and seen in the court.

Everybody here is equal. That means that you

JUDI JOHNSON, RPR, CRR, CLR - Official Court Reporter

PROCEEDINGS

shouldn't, when you come into court, have any view about how l the case should be decided. Later on, after you consider the 2 evidence, of course you'll have a view. The police officers are equal here to the plaintiff because everybody in the federal court is equal. Nobody's entitled to greater or less consideration.

Now, I'll say that somebody has the burden of proof or something has to be proven by somebody as to particular issues. I mean that considering all of the evidence in the case, no matter who put it in, the party's claim on that issue 10 must be established as more probably true than not true. If 11 the probabilities are equal, then the scales are equally balanced, and the party that has the burden has not met his burden of proof.

Is that clear?

(Jury nodding.)

16 THE COURT: The first of the three claims the 17 plaintiff makes is that the arrest was illegal because of what 18 happened at the scene and that the statements made at various times by the defendants were false, which the defendants denge that. Second, the criminal charges were based upon 21 fabricated, that is, made-up evidence regarding the events 22 that occurred that night and the prosecution was maliciously 23 brought against the plaintiff at the instigation, essentially,

24 of the defendants. And that, third, the defendants violated 25 **PROCEEDINGS**

116

the plaintiff's constitutional right to a fair trial by presenting false evidence to state prosecutors in the case.

So the first issue is whether the plaintiff was falsely arrested. The second issue is whether the plaintiff was maliciously prosecuted. Third, whether the plaintiff was denied the constitutional right to a fair trial. And only if you find one or more of these questions or issues in favor of the plaintiff will you be required to consider the amount of damages.

You understand that? Unless the defendant or one of them is liable, you don't have to go to damages. Is that clear?

(Jury nodding.)

THE COURT: The plaintiff has the burden of proving each element of the claims, except for the probable cause element of his false arrest claim. The burden is on a defendant to prove that he had probable cause to arrest the plaintiff.

Now, you have to decide the case unanimously. All of you have to agree on the answer to the questions on the verdict sheet that I'll read to you in a moment.

You'll have a list of the witnesses. You'll have a list of the documents, and those will be sent in to you. If you want the documents, either individually or all together, we'll send them in.

Case: 12-2479 Document: 40-1 Page: 23 09/27/2012 731928

A1217

1

6

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

24

25

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

ď5

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

119

117

PROCEEDINGS

You'll send a note in. You'll communicate with me through a note to the marshal from your foreperson.

1

2

3

4

5

6 7

8

9

10

12 13

14

15

16 17

18 19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1

2

3

4

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

There were objections made and rulings I made during the course of the trial. Draw no inferences from them. If I had something stricken, put it out of your mind. If a question wasn't answered, don't rely on the question. It's the question and answer both together that count.

Give the evidence the weight you think it deserves, analyze it dispassionately, rationally and without prejudice or emotion and draw whatever almost inferences you think follow as a rational view of what happened here in your attempt to decide what happened that night.

The opening and closings are not evidence. Now, critically in this case is the question of who's telling the truth. That is veracity. You can consider each witness's demeanor, that is, what they appeared to be, from their facial and other actions on the witness stand, the way they testified, the opportunity they had to see and hear and know about the events that night, the ability of the witness to describe and recall and the reasonableness of the testimony in light of all of the evidence in the case. You can consider whether the testimony was contradicted by other 22 people's testimony or by what the witness said on an earlier 2.3 occasion.

If you find a witness has falsely testified as to

JUDI JOHNSON, RPR, CRR, CLR - Official Court Reporter

PROCEEDINGS

anything, you may find other elements of what he said or she said was true. But if you find that a person deliberately lied to you, you can ignore all of that witness's testimony. A witness may be mistaken without deliberately lying.

There was testimony about some of what was said outside of court. You were indeed there to hear that cross-examined immediately. But you consider the veracity of what was said at that time outside of court in the same way as you try to determine the veracity of a witness before you.

There were a few witnesses here with expert backgrounds. If you believe they were experts, you may give their opinions such weight as you think they deserve, applying also all of the other elements of veracity considerations because they are witnesses as well as people with special backgrounds.

I made some findings. I'll indicate one of them, at least, in the course of these discussions; and when I tell you you must find something, then you will follow that instruction.

The claims by the plaintiff are made under Section 1983 of Title 42 of the United States Code, so-called civil rights law, against the officers, Salim Randall and Michael Burbridge. And essentially the law provides for a claim in a civil court -- and this court is now sitting as a civil court -- against individuals who have deprived people of

JUDI JOHNSON, RPR, CRR, CLR - Official Court Reporter

PROCEEDINGS

their constitutional rights if they are state or local officials acting under state color of law. The statute says every person who under color of any statute, ordinance, regulation, custom or usage of any state or territory of the District of Columbia -- here it's the State of New York -subjects or causes to be subject any citizen of the United States -- that is here, the plaintiff -- or other person within the jurisdiction to the deprivation of any rights,

privilege -- privileges or immunity secured by the constitution or law shall be liable in damages to the injured party. Four things have to be made out to establish a claim

under that statute. First, that the defendant acted intentionally or recklessly. Second, that the conduct complained of was committed by a person acting under color state law. Third, that the conduct deprived the plaintiff of a right, privilege or immunity secured by the constitution of the United States or the laws. Here it's the constitution. Fourth, that the defendant's acts were a proximate cause of damages he sustained.

An act is intentional if it's done knowingly, that is, if it's done voluntarily and deliberately and not because of a mistake, accident, negligence or any other innocent reason.

An act is reckless if it is done in conscious

PROCEEDINGS

disregard of its known probable consequences.

120

118

The defendants, as New York State police officers, were acting under color of state law when they arrested the plaintiff. So this element is considered and should be considered by you to have been satisfied or proven.

Now, then the deprivation of a constitutional right has to be shown. The first claim of a deprivation is that the plaintiff was falsely arrested. He claims that the defendants falsely arrested him on May 15th, 2008 in violation of the Fourth Amendment to the Constitution. A person is falsely arrested when the defendant intended to confine the plaintiff, and here that was shown by the handcuffing and taking the plaintiff to the station house. Second, the plaintiff was conscious of the confinement. And here obviously he was. Third, that the plaintiff did not consent to the confinement. And here, he did not. And fourth, the confinement was not privileged. And that's the issue here, was the confinement privileged for these two defendants on that night.

The initial stop was lawful. You can assume that. That's not the violation that's claimed here. The evidence relating to observation and acts surrounding the stop may be considered in deciding credibility. So you can consider all of the evidence from the time they first observed, according to their evidence, the defendant up to the time when he was placed under arrest.

JUDI JOHNSON, RPR, CRR, CLR - Official Court Reporter

A1218

5

12

13

14

17

3

4

7

10

11

12

13

121

PROCEEDINGS

Now, you have to decide whether the arrest was privileged, that is to say whether there was probable cause for the arrest at the time he was taken into custody. The defendants contend that there was probable cause to arrest the plaintiff for the illegal possession of a firearm. There's no question that that was a firearm that was picked up. Nobody 6 denies that. The plaintiff contends that there was no probable cause to arrest him for that crime. Because it would've been a crime for him to have possessed that firearm, 9

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15 16

17

18

19

2.0

21

2.2

23

24

25

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

If there was an objectively reasonable ground for an 11 officer's belief that a crime was being committed by the possession of that gun by the plaintiff, then the arrest was privileged. If one defendant, one police officer among the three had probable cause to arrest, then both these defendants 5 are deemed to have had probable cause. An officer may rely off information supplied to him by another officer who made 18 observations at the scene.

The existence of probable cause is measured at the 19 moment of arrest. You may, however, consider as one piece p20 evidence, together with all of the evidence in the case, the 21 fact that the charges against the plaintiff were later 22 dismissed in determining whether the probable cause to arres23 24

The failure of an officer to make a further inquiry 25

JUDI JOHNSON, RPR, CRR, CLR - Official Court Reporter

PROCEEDINGS

before making an arrest when a reasonable person would have done so may but does necessarily show a lack of probable cause. An officer is not required to conduct a full investigation prior to executing an arrest, but he may not ignore relevant evidence that he is aware of at the time or deliberately disregard facts that he is aware of at the time if the evidence or facts tends to rebut the existence of probable cause to arrest. And the defendant has the burden of showing that the burden cause to arrest existed in this case.

With regard to the substantive crime to which -- on which plaintiff's arrest was premised, a person is guilty of the criminal possession of a weapon when he possesses any firearm except under limited circumstances not relevant here. So if he possessed a firearm, he was guilty of that possession under the New York penal law.

Second, malicious prosecution is claimed by the plaintiff, and it's claimed that it occurred through the defendants providing false statements to and withholding relevant evidence that each was aware of from a state prosecuting attorney. The plaintiff was indicted on -- for the criminal possession of a weapon.

A defendant cannot be held liable for what he said to the grand jury. He may beheld liable for what he said to the prosecutor if his statement was not in preparation for his grand jury testimony.

JUDI JOHNSON, RPR, CRR, CLR - Official Court Reporter

PROCEEDINGS

A person is maliciously prosecuted when, first, criminal proceedings are initiated or continued against him by2 the defendant. Two, the proceedings are terminated in his favor. Three, there was no probable cause for the commencement of the proceeding. And four, the defendant's 5 actions leading to the initiation of proceeding against the plaintiff were motivated by malice of a defendant.

There's no dispute that criminal proceedings were commenced and continued and that they ended in plaintiff's favor. The critical decision for you is whether there was probable cause for the initiation of the proceedings and whether a defendant's assistance in the initiation of the proceedings was motivated by malice.

Probable cause to prosecute exists when the facts 14 and circumstances within the person's knowledge at the time 116 takes steps to proceed with the prosecution are sufficient for 16 a person of reasonable prudence to believe that a violation of 17 law was committed. 18

A grand jury's indictment creates a presumption that9 probable cause for prosecution existed. You may find the 20 presumption rebutted, that is, overcome, and that no probable1 cause for prosecution existed based on all of the evidence. 22

The critical question here is whether either or both 23 of the defendant officers believed that there was probable 24 cause to initiate or assist in the prosecution of plaintiff. 25

JUDI JOHNSON, RPR, CRR, CLR - Official Court Reporter

PROCEEDINGS

122

A defendant initiates or continues a prosecution maliciously if he initiates or continues it for a wrongful purpose, that is, if his goal is not to bring an alleged defendant to justice. For example, if he acts out of ill will or personal hostility towards a persona accused or he acts out of a desire to punish a person without due process of law, then he can be said to have acted with malice.

You are permitted but not required to infer that malice existed if you find that a defendant lacked probable cause to initiate and continue with the charges against the plaintiff.

If probable cause existed for these officers to present the evidence they did to the state prosecuting attorney, then you must find for the defendants on this claim, If no probable cause existed but the defendant did not act with malice, then you must find for the defendants on this claim.

The third constitutional claim plaintiff makes is with a constitutional right to a fair trial. Every person has a right not to be prosecuted on the basis of information that is known by the government to be false. The government's doing so violates the constitution.

The question for you on this claim is whether the plaintiff has proven that the defendants, or either one of them, knowingly created false evidence and presented it to the

A1219

10

11

12

14

15

20

21

22

23

24

25

125 **PROCEEDINGS** 1 prosecutor, leading to a deprivation of the plaintiff's 1 2 liberty. If a defendant presented accurate evidence to the prosecutor or presented false evidence thinking it was true, 3 4 then you must find for the defendant. And I've already told 5 you a few moments ago that what was told to the prosecutor in5 the grand jury room or in preparation is not what we're 7 talking about here. It's at other times. 8 8 Do you understand that? 9 (Jury nodding.) 10 THE COURT: The third element that plaintiff must0 11 prove is that the acts of Officer Randall and officer 12 Burbridge were a proximate cause of injuries he sustained. 12 13 There can be more than one cause that's proximate. 14 An injury or damage is proximally caused by an act 14 15 or failure to act whenever the act or omission played a 15 substantial part in bringing about or actually causing the 16 16 17 injury or damage and that the injury was the direct or 17 18 reasonably probable consequence of the act or omission. 19 To recover damages, Marshall has the burden, that 20 is, the plaintiff, of proving that he suffered an injury and 21 that the injury would not have occurred without the wrongful 21 22

18 19 20 conduct of a defendant. 22 23

If you find the plaintiff has proven one of his three claims, you are going to have to determine damages, if 24 any, that he sustained and proved. Don't infer that he had 25

23

24

25

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

JUDI JOHNSON, RPR, CRR, CLR - Official Court Reporter

126 **PROCEEDINGS** damages merely because I am instructing you. It's exclusively vour function to determine liability and damages.

He's seeking first compensatory damages. If liability is proven on one of the claims, you will award the plaintiff sufficient damages to compensate him for any injury proximally caused by one of the defendants' actions in creating the liability. Damages of this type is known as compensatory damages. Their purpose is to make the plaintiff whole, that is, to give back, to the extent that money can, the problem or injury that he -- for the injury that he suffered. Those damages should be fair and reasonable, neither inadequate nor excessive, and they should be only for injuries the plaintiff suffered or is reasonably likely to suffer as a proximate result of an injury claimed and proved

The plaintiff claims as the injury that he spent four and a half months in jail. He is not seeking recovery for any emotional or psychological injuries. He is not seeking recovery for loss of earnings. That is, for any emotional or psychological injuries that continued after the jail. He is seeking damages for the time he spent in jail.

In awarding compensatory damages, be guided by dispassionate common sense. Use such definitiveness and accuracy as the circumstances permit.

Each defendant is entitled to fair, separate and individual consideration both as to liability and as to

JUDI JOHNSON, RPR, CRR, CLR - Official Court Reporter

PROCEEDINGS damages. It's as if you were trying two separate trials at 1 the same time. Is that clear to you? 3 (Jury nodding.) THE COURT: If you find that only one is responsible for a particular injury, then you must impose damages, if any, 6 for that injury only upon that defendant. If you find no injuries by any of the defendants, then you'll rule 8 accordingly. 9

The plaintiff is also asking for punitive damages. Should you award compensatory damages, you may award additional punitive damages if you find that a defendant engaged in extraordinary misconduct. You may do so to express your disapproval and to serve as an example or warning to others who might otherwise engage in similar conduct.

If you find in favor of plaintiff and against the 16 defendant and if you finds that the defendant acted so 17 maliciously, wantonly or oppressively as to warrant an award 18 of punitive damages, you may make such an award. 19

To justify an award of punitive damages, a defendant's misconduct must be based upon a reckless or callous disregard of the rights of the plaintiff or a gross indifference treasure them. You may also award punitive damages if a defendant acted to punish the plaintiff out of ill will or spite.

JUDI JOHNSON, RPR, CRR, CLR - Official Court Reporter

PROCEEDINGS

You may assess punitive damages or any damages against either or both of the defendants, or in the case of punitive damages, you may refuse to assess them at all.

If punitive damages are assessed against more than one defendant, the amount may be the same or may be different.

When you begin your deliberations, don't communicate with anybody outside the jury room except in writing through the marshal, who will give me the note, and then I'll communicate back or call you back into court.

You can ask for help on the law or anything else.

Be respectful to each other when you're having your discussions. Don't hesitate to change your mind after considering what other people say, but each of you is entitled to your individual vote and must exercise your individual judgment. And when the verdict comes in, you will each be asked if that is your verdict.

Don't tell me how the vote stands until you come into court. If you've reached a verdict, don't report to me what it is. You will be asked that in open court. Inform the Court in writing when you've reached a verdict without indicating what that verdict is.

You'll render your verdict without fear or without favor, without prejudice and without sympathy.

> Now, these are the questions you'll have to answer. First, did Randall falsely arrest the plaintiff?

	PROCEEDINGS 129		PROCEEDINGS 130
1	Yes or no.	1	MS. SANDS: Your Honor
2	Did Officer Burbridge falsely arrest the plaintiff?	2	THE COURT: Do you wish to see me at the side bar?
3	Yes or no.	3	MS. SANDS: 1 do.
4	Did Officer Randall maliciously prosecute the	4	THE COURT: Come to the side bar.
5	plaintiff? Yes or no.	5	(At the bench.)
6	Did Officer Burbridge maliciously prosecute the	6	MS. SANDS: Your Honor, I think you misread the
7	plaintiff? Yes or no.	7	question 3A.
8	Did Officer Randall violate the plaintiff's	8	THE COURT: You're turning to page?
9	constitutional right to a fair trial by knowingly presenting	9	MS. SANDS: Page 13, question 3A.
10	false evidence to the prosecutor? I'm sorry, in preparation	10	(In open court.)
11	for the grand jury.	11	THE COURT: 3A on Page 13 reads: Did Officer
12	Did officer Burbridge violate plaintiff's	12	Randall violate plaintiff's constitutional right to a fair
13	constitutional right to a fair trial by knowingly presenting	13	trial by knowingly presenting false evidence to the prosecutor
14	false evidence to the prosecutor under similar circumstances	?14	under the circumstances I described? Yes or no.
15	If your answers to all those questions is no, you	15	MS. SANDS: Okay.
16	don't have to answer any of the following questions because	16	THE COURT: No other objections are made.
17	there won't be any damages to assess. If you find that a	17	Swear the marshal, please.
18	defendant is or has violated a right, then you'll determine	18	THE CLERK: Do you swear or affirm that you will
19	compensatory damages first attributable to Officer Burbrid	e49	keep the jurors sworn in this cause together in some private
20	second, attributable to Officer Randall. Then, if you find	20	and convenient place, that you shall suffer no one to speak to
21	punitive damages, how much against Officer Burbridge	21	them nor shall you speak to them unless it be at the direction
22	Officer Randall, rather, and then against Officer Burbridge	22	of the court to ask if they have agreed upon a verdict?
23	Do any attorneys wish to see me at the side bar?	23	THE MARSHAL: I do.
24	MR. NORINSBERG: No, your Honor.	24	THE COURT: Thank you.
25	MS. CASTRO: No, your Honor.	25	Continue your deliberations until I tell you to
	JUDI JOHNSON, RPR, CRR, CLR - Official Court Rep	j orter	JUDI JOHNSON, RPR, CRR, CLR - Official Court Report

	PROCEEDINGS 131		PROCEEDINGS 132
1	stop. Now, if you want to go beyond 4:30 p.m., send in a	1	the list, please. Gather all of the exhibits. Nothing is to
2	note.	2	go in until I go through it.
3	(The jury exited.)	3	MR. COHEN: You have all the exhibits that we put
4	THE COURT: The instructions I read from, which	h√sve	in.
5	just distributed, is Court Exhibit 2, I think, of today's	5	THE COURT: Make up your list and put it all
6	date. The brief is marked 1, and this jury charge I gave is	6	together.
7	marked Exhibit 2.	7	I should say I appreciate the cooperation and fine
8	(Court Exhibit 1 was received in evidence, as of	8	professional lawyering of both sides.
9	this date.)	9	MS. GROSS: Thank you, your Honor.
10	(Court Exhibit 2 was received in evidence, as of	10	MR. COHEN: Thank you, your Honor.
11	this date.)	11	If I can make one request. Once the jury does have
12	THE COURT: And we have prior drafts. There i	: 48	a verdict, we would like to speak to them.
13	April 24th draft, which is marked Exhibit 3.	13	THE COURT: You're free to do so. It's up to them
14	(Court Exhibit 3 was received in evidence, as of	14	whether they want to talk to you.
15	this date.)	15	MR. COHEN: Can you just ask them if they want to
16	THE COURT: There's an April 20th draft which	is16	stick around, to let them know that the attorneys would like
17	marked 4.	17	to
18	(Court Exhibit 4 was received in evidence, as of	18	THE COURT: I will tell them. Yes, I will do that
19	this date.)	19	MS. GROSS: Defendants join in that request.
20	THE COURT: And there's an April 17th draft, w	h i20 i	THE COURT: I will do that.
21	is marked 5.	21	(Recess.)
22	(Court Exhibit 5 in evidence, was received as of	22	THE COURT: Yes, what can I do to help you?
23	this date.)	23	MS. CASTRO: We've gathered all of the exhibits an
24	THE COURT: Do you have a list of the witnesses,	24	created a witness list.
25	please? Do you have a list of the exhibits, please? Make up	25	THE COURT: May I see the witness list, please.
	JUDI JOHNSON, RPR, CRR, CLR - Official Court Rep		

Case: 12-2479 Document: 40-1 Page: 27 09/27/2012 731928 126

	PROCEEDINGS 133		PROCEEDINGS 134
1	MS. CASTRO: Yes, your Honor.	1	Defendant's Exhibit 8, where is it?
2	THE COURT: Is this satisfactory?	2	MS. CASTRO: Our exhibits are lettered, your Honor
3	MR. COHEN: I didn't look at the witness list, but	3	THE COURT: Defendant's Exhibit F1.
4	I'm sure it's fine.	4	MS. SANDS: It's a blowup.
5	THE COURT: Look at it.	5	THE COURT: Defendant's Exhibit D1.
6	Mark that as Court Exhibit 6.	6	MS. SANDS: Right here.
7	(Court Exhibit 6 was received in evidence, as of	7	THE COURT: Defendant's Exhibit C1.
8	this date.)	8	MS. SANDS: The gun.
9	THE COURT: Where is the list of exhibits?	9	THE COURT: Defendant's Exhibit G, Defendant's
10	MR. COHEN: I reviewed that, that's fine.	10	Exhibit E.
11	THE COURT: You have reviewed it?	11	MS. SANDS: Your Honor, there were two smaller
12	MR. COHEN: Yes.	12	version E, and the blowup was E1.
13	Your Honor, there's one little minor issue. I don't	13	THE COURT: Okay. Let me have E, please, and El.
14	think it should be an issue. There are large blowups of the	14	Are those all the exhibits now that you have?
15	exhibits we did get admitted. Does it matter that they are	15	MS. SANDS: That's all the exhibits.
16	all exhibits that were admitted.	16	THE COURT: Now let me see the plaintiff's blow up
17	THE COURT: Send in all the blowups that the ju	r yi 7	MR. COHEN: This is, I believe this is the
18	saw.	18	complete report. I don't know what number it says right
19	Mark this list of exhibits as Exhibit 7.	19	there, complete report. It's Exhibit 16.
20	(Court Exhibit 7 was received in evidence, as of	20	THE COURT: 16, plus I'll mark it 16 blowup.
21	this date.)	21	What's the next one?
22	THE COURT: Plaintiff's Exhibit 1, Plaintiff's	22	MR. COHEN: The next one was the handwritten
23	Exhibit 2, Plaintiff's Exhibit 3, Plaintiff's Exhibit 6,	23	complaint report.
24	Plaintiff's Exhibit 11, Plaintiff's Exhibit 16, Plaintiff's	24	THE COURT: Which is Exhibit?
25	Exhibit 17, Plaintiff's Exhibit 18.	25	MR. COHEN: I believe it's
	JUDI JOHNSON, RPR, CRR, CLR - Official Court Rep	orter	JUDI JUHNSON, RPR, CRR, CLR - Official Court Report

	PROCEEDINGS 135	1	PROCEEDINGS 136
	. No cedanitos	١.	1110 020211100
1	THE COURT: Exhibit 2?	1 2	compensatory damages were a prerequisite to punitive damages.
2		1	No have long recognized, in Section 1983 cases, that punitive
3	which is Exhibit 1. Randall's memo book. Yeah. And then		damages may be awarded even in the absence of compensatory
4	last one is the criminal complaint, which is which is	4	awards. See E.G., King and Stolberg.
5	Exhibit 17.	5	Bring in the jury. I'm going to properly instruct
6	THE COURT: Plus the blowup.	6	them.
7	Ask the marshal to come in and take all of this.	7	MR. COHEN: Could we just address this point for one
8	(Marshal enters.)	8	second before the jury comes in?
9	THE COURT: Take these in there, please.	9	THE COURT: Yes.
10	(Marshal takes lists to the jury.)	10	MR. COHEN: Your Honor, there's a decision in
11	Mark this as a Court exhibit.	11	Kerman v. City of New York which finds that when there is a
12	They're asking for all of the exhibits.	12	finding of a constitutional right violation, compensatory
13	(Court Exhibit 8 was received in evidence, as of	13	damages are obligatory. They're mandatory if they find that
14	this date.)	14	our client was deprived of a constitutional right.
15	(Recess.)	15	THE COURT: I wanted to put in nominal. You agree
16	(Court Exhibit 9 was recieved in evidence, as of this date.)	16	to take it out.
17	THE COURT: We have a note from the jury, Cou	d 7	MR. COHEN: I understand. The point is that
18	Exhibit 9, "Can we give punitive award without giving	18	deprivation of liberty is not actually, that case
19	compensatory?" The Court said it couldn't without objection	n 19	specifically deals with the fact when a right is found to be
20	from any party. However, research that we've just done	20	violated and there is time in jail, that there has to be
21	indicates I was wrong. Second Circuit is clear on the point,	21	compensation for that time. The loss of liberty claim, in and
22	Robinson v. Cattaraugus, C-A-T-T-A-R-A-U-G-U-S, County	247	of itself, is more than just nominal if there's actually a
23	F.3d 153, Second Circuit, 1998.	23	finding of the right being violated. The case is Kerman,
24	We note that the original instruction as well as the	24	K-E-R-M-A-N.
25	verdict formed erred, E-R-R-E-D, in indicating that	25	THE COURT: Where is it from?
	JUDI JOHNSON, KPR, CRR, CLR - Official Court Re] porter	JUDI JOHNSON, RPR, CRR, CLR - Official Court Reporte

A1222

	PROCEEDINGS 137		PROCEEDINGS 138
1	MR. COHEN: I believe it's the Second Circuit.	1	Honor. If I could just have one minute. Kerman is 374 F.3d
2	MR. NORINSBERG: Second Circuit.	2	93. It's a Second Circuit decision from 2004. And if you
3	MR. COHEN: I have the case cite in my bag.	3	look at Pages 123 to 125, the quote is well, what I've
4	MR. NORINSBERG: It's definitely Second Circu	t. 4	quoted for is "recognizing that loss of liberty and emotional
5	MR. COHEN: I'm sure it was referenced in my n	otfon	injuries are independent of each other and"
6	in limine papers, your Honor.	6	THE COURT: Start again.
7	THE COURT: Why didn't you object to the charg	e?7	MR. COHEN: "the tort of false arrest and
8	MR. NORINSBERG: We did. That's why we opp	os&d	malicious prosecution are complete with even a brief restrain
9	nominal damages. If there's a deprivation of liberty in any	9	of the Plaintiff's freedom, it is not necessary that any
0	magnitude, Kerman says there has to be an award of some	10	damages result from it other than the confinement, itself."
1	monetary compensation.	11	That's just for the portion that states that the
2	THE COURT: You disagree?	12	loss of freedom is a compensatory damage. But I believe,
3	MS. SANDS: We disagree, your Honor.	13	later on in the case, it talks about how there must be
4	THE COURT: Have you got a case?	14	compensatory damages if a loss of liberty is found.
5	MS. SANDS: We don't have a case handy, but we	15	THE COURT: Bring in the jury.
6	certainly disagree that - I know the case you just read, but	16	MS. SANDS: Your Honor, I believe that case focus
7	we feel there has to be liability before they can	17	on nominal damages, basically nominal damages if the jury
8	THE COURT: Well, of course there has to be	18	found that there was a breach of constitutional rights.
9	liability. That's not what we're talking about.	19	THE COURT: There has to be some damages.
0	MR. NORINSBERG: Your Honor, the jury migh	1200	MS. SANDS: They couldn't be nominal. They wou
1	asking that question: If they don't find liability, can they	21	have to be
2	still award punitive damages?	22	THE COURT: But everybody agreed to strike the
3	THE COURT: There has to be liability. What is	h 2 3	nominal. I thought that the nominal was appropriate, but I'
4	citation?	24	bring in the jury and tell them they have to find some
:5	MR. COHEN: I'm looking for my motion papers,	y ðár	damages.

	PROCEEDINGS 139		PROCEEDINGS 140
1	Bring in the jury.	1	question, "Can we give punitive awards without giving
2	(The jury entered.)	2	compensatory," theoretically, you can. You can give punitive
3	THE COURT: I want to correct what I think is in	аß	without compensatory if you found liability. Do you
4	error in the charge. As suggested in your note, Court	4	understand?
5	Exhibit 9, "Can we give punitive award without giving	5	(Jury nodding.)
6	compensatory"?	6	THE COURT: But it's hard for me to see how if you
7	First, if he was deprived of a constitutional	7	find liability and you find that he was deprived of his
8	right - that is, there is liability that's the first	8	liberty, you cannot give him some compensatory damages. I m
9	question. In order to give damages, there has to be	9	not telling you what to do, but it does seem to me that once
10	liability. Do you all understand that?	10	you find liability which caused a deprivation of his
11	(Jury nodding.)	11	liberty either for four and a half months or for a lesser
12	THE COURT: Anybody have any question about	hb2?	time while he was arrested, et cetera that's a]]
13	If there's no liability, there's no damages. Do you	13	deprivation.
14	understand that? Everybody understand that?	14	You've got to find some violation first, some
15	(Jury nodding.)	15	liability. Then, after you find liability as if you do, as
16	THE COURT: Assuming you find liability and	'116	I suggested, the next thing is compensatory damages. Now, if
17	not saying you should or shouldn't, do you understand? If yo	uil 7	you do find liability, it's, again, hard for me to see how you
18	find liability, and flowing from that liability as a proximate	18	cannot find some compensatory damages and he would be entitle
19	cause was deprival of the Plaintiff's liberty, either while he	19	to compensatory damages for a deprivation. Do you understand
20	was arrested in violation of his rights — if you find that	20	that?
21	or for another reason in violation of his rights, he was	21	(Jury nodding.)
22	incarcerated for a substantial length of time, then he is	22	THE COURT: If the deprivation was caused by the
23	entitled to compensatory damages. Do you understand that?	23	denial. Do vou understand?
24	(Jury nodding.)	24	(Jury nodding.)
25	THE COURT: How much is for you to decide. So	tB5	THE COURT: Therefore, the question of whether we
	JUDI JUHNSON, RPR, CRR, CLR - Official Court Rep] orter	JUDI JOHNSON, RPR, CRR, CLR - Official Court Reporte

question, "Can we give punitive awards without giving					
compensatory," theoretically, you can. You can give punitive					
without compensatory if you found liability. Do you					
understand?					
(Jury nodding.)					
THE COURT: But it's hard for me to s	ee how if you				
find liability and you find that he was deprived of	his				
liberty, you cannot give him some compensatory d	amages. I m				
not telling you what to do, but it does seem to me	that once				
you find liability which caused a deprivation of hi	s				
liberty either for four and a half months or for	a lesser				
time while he was arrested, et cetera that's all					
deprivation.					
You've got to find some violation first, so	me				
liability. Then, after you find liability as if you	do, as				
I suggested, the next thing is compensatory damage	ges. Now, if				
you do find liability, it's, again, hard for me to see	how you				
cannot find some compensatory damages and he v	vould be entitled				
to compensatory damages for a deprivation. Do you understand					
that?					
(Jury nodding.)					
THE COURT: If the deprivation was c	aused by the				
denial. Do you understand?					
(Jury nodding.)					
THE COURT: Therefore, the question	of whether we				
	1				

	PROCEEDINGS 141		PROCEEDINGS 142
1	can give punitive without giving compensatory is more a	1	It's 374 F.3d 93. And it's at 124, the beginning discussion.
2	theoretical question than a real question because if you're	2	What is the Plaintiff's position with respect to
3	going to give him compensatory under that hypothesis that y	pu3	what I just told the jury?
4	found liability and deprivation, you would then go to decide	4	MR. NORINSBERG: We have no objection. We fee
5	the punitive. So you wouldn't have a situation, can we give	5	a proper statement of the law based on what you just read to
6	punitive - a punitive award without giving compensatory.	6	us in that case law.
7	Does that answer your question?	7	THE COURT: What's the Defendant's position?
8	THE JUROR: Your Honor, may I speak?	8	MS. SANDS: At this point, your Honor, Defendant's
9	THE COURT: 1'd rather you go back, consider the	e 9	position is that the jury doesn't understand what the they
10	question you want to ask so that all the jurors agree on	10	don't understand the instruction. I don't know what their
11	that's the way it should be phrased, if possible. And then,	11	question is going to be subsequently. We have to see. But
12	come in, send that in again. I don't want you to begin	12	there's clearly an inconsistency here.
13	deliberations now because I want to consult with the attorne	vs13	THE COURT: Do you object to what I just told then
14	and then call you in. But if you have a note, send it in. Do	14	Do you want to consult with the other attorneys for a few
15	you all agree to that?	15	minutes?
16	(Jury nodding.)	16	MS. SANDS: Yeah, sure. Can we have a few minute
17	THE COURT: Any objection?	17	outside the courtroom?
18	MS. GROSS: No objection, your Honor.	18	THE COURT: Yes. Try to be prompt because the ju
19	MS. SANDS: No objection.	19	is talking about the same problem.
20	MR. COHEN: No objection.	20	MS. SANDS: Yes.
21	THE COURT: All right. Go in and see what you	waat	(Whereupon, a discussion was held off the record.)
22	to do about another question.	22	MS. GROSS: We're ready, your Honor.
23	(The jury exited.)	23	THE COURT: I'll hear from the Defendant.
24	THE COURT: My discussion was based on the ca	e34	MS. GROSS: Your Honor, the defense does object to
25	cited on punitive as well as on the Kerman case, K-E-R-M-A	-385	the instruction as given. As we understand these cases and

		٦ .	
	PROCEEDINGS 143		PROCEEDINGS 144
1	we have not briefed them at any length, and we're just seein	g 1	additional time, and had found the wording in Section 4, Part
2	Robinson now today my understanding of the case law is t	na ž	B to be confusing. We wanted to ask first before making our
3	punitive damages are awardable in the absence of compensa	logy	ruling. You have since clarified the confusion."
4	damages so long as there has been a nominal damage award	4	I don't know whether they mean I've made it more
5	In Robinson, there was a two-dollar nominal dama	ge 5	confusing, or less. In any event, that's what we have. So
6	award, no compensatory given, punitive damages were given	,a6nd	apparently, they're satisfied with the instructions. How
7	the court affirmed it. Robinson predates Kerman. Kerman	now	would you like me to modify it for the Defendant?
8	says no nominal damages where there's been a deprivation of	yr 8	MS. GROSS: We object to the instruction as it now
9	liberty. So you have to give a compensatory damage award i	if 9	stands. We believe that there was a misstatement of the
10	there has been a deprivation. So the cases don't fit directly	10	law
11	together. So I think that to cite Robinson for the	11	THE COURT: What would you like me to tell the jun
12	proposition that one can award punitive damages in the absorber	nt2	in answer to their two notes, Court Exhibit 9 and 10?
13	of compensatory damages is a misstatement of the law. The	e13	(Court Exhibit 10 was received into evidence, as of
14	has to have been an anchoring or nominal damage award to	a Ware	this date.)
15	punitive damages in the absence of compensatory damages.	15	MS. GROSS: Well, I think we're in uncharted water
16	THE COURT: Well, my original approach to the	abte	here, your Honor.
17	without objection from any of the parties and I don't	17	THE COURT: We may be uncharted, but I must -
18	criticize your work, of course, because it's been excellent	18	MS. GROSS: Yes, I agree.
19	was that without some damage award, whether it's called	19	THE COURT: make a decision based upon your
20	"nominal" or "compensatory," I couldn't see punitive becau	s20	recommendations and my research. What shall I tell the jury?
21	it just seemed contrary to basic jurisprudence, American	21	MS. GROSS: We would submit that the instruction a
22	jurisprudence. The Supreme Court has been wrestling with	t B Bs	it originally stood, that punitive damages cannot be awarded
23	punitive matter as a constitutional issue.	23	in the absence of compensatory damages, was the correct
24	We have a note from the jury, punitive damages	24	statement of the law as a result of Robinson and Kerman read
25	follow-up. "Your Honor, we had reviewed the Packet 1 an	25	together. We're in uncharted waters with respect to the
	JUDI JOHNSON, RPR, CRR, CLR - Official Court Rej	j porter	•
	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,		,

Case: 12-2479 Document: 40-1 Page: 30 09/27/2012 731928 126

	PROCEEDINGS 145		PROCEEDINGS 146
1	nominal damages in the 1983 cases. I think the original	1	(Jury affirms.)
2	instruction as it stands is valid.	2	THE COURT: Now, the second thing is, we can't star
3	THE COURT: Thank you. And the Plaintiff wan	s Bo	tomorrow until 11. Do you want to continue tonight, or do you
4	have stand what I just told them?	4	want to come back at 11 tomorrow? Send in a note. Discuss it
5	MR. COHEN: Yeah.	5	among yourselves, and send in a note. I'll either let you go
6	THE COURT: Bring in the jury.	6	home, or keep you a little longer if you're about to reach a
7	Tomorrow, we can't start before 11. So if they wan	t 7	verdict, or you'll come in at 11 tomorrow.
8	to continue tomorrow, we'll start at 11. I will get to the	8	(The jury exited.)
9	courthouse between 10:30 and 11. I have an important medi	ca ll	THE COURT: Stand by.
10	appointment. I'm not sure exactly when the doctor will let n	el 0	(Court Exhibit 10 was received in evidence, as of
11	go. So I won't be here possibly between 11 and 11:30, but I	11	this date.)
12	can answer notes over the phone or otherwise. Any objection	12	(Recess.)
13	to that?	13	(Continued on the next page.)
14	MS. GROSS: No, your Honor.	14	
15	MR. NORINSBERG: No objection.	15	
16	(The jury entered.)	16	
17	THE COURT: Well, you're an excellent jury. An	117	
18	what I now say should not be taken as criticizing you or	18	
19	denigrating what you do at all because you've done just the	19	
20	right thing. But you end by saying you have since clarified	20	
21	the confusion. Does that mean that you're no longer confuse	d 2 1	
22	or that I've made it even more confusing?	22	
23	THE JUROR: All I was saying was that portion of	Chile	
24	testimony	24	
25	THE COURT: Have I removed the confusion?	25	
	JUDI JOHNSON, RPR, CRR, CLR - Official Court Rep	orter	JUDI JOHNSON, RPR, CRR, CLR - Official Court Report

	PROCEEDINGS 147		P	ROCEEDINGS	148
1	(Honorable Jack B. Weinstein takes the bench.)	1			
2	THE COURT: Sit down, please.	2		INDEX	
3	(The jury is in the courtroom at 4:40 p.m.)	3	<u>WITNESS</u>	PAGE	
4	THE COURT: Be seated, please. Now, be here at	4	Officer Sena		ł
5	11:00 tomorrow.	5	Direct/Redirect	21	
6	I don't want you to discuss this case with anyone,	6	Cross	28	
7	is that clear? I don't want you to do any research. Don't	7			
8	read the news tonight or tomorrow morning, okay, and keep	ar8	Mrs. Lamouse-Smith	<u>!</u>	ì
9	open mind. Until all of you are in the jury room, there will	9	Direct/Redirect	51/65	
10	be no deliberations.	10	Cross/Recross	58/66	
11	Good night and have a pleasant evening.	11			
12	JUROR: Quick question. We leave all our stuff in	12		COURT EXHIBITS	
13	there, the paperwork?	13	EXHIBIT NO.	<u>PAGE</u>	
14	THE COURT: You can leave the paperwork, yes.	14	Exhibit 1		
15	(Jury is out of the courtroom at 4: 41 p.m.)	15	Exhibit 2		
16	(Proceedings adjourned until tomorrow, 4/26/12 at	16	Exhibit 3		
17	11:00 a.m.)	17	Exhibit 4		
18		18	Exhibit 5		
19		19	Exhibit 6		
20		20	Exhibit 7		ĺ
21		21	Exhibit 8		
22		22	Exhibit 9		
23		23	Exhibit 10		
24		24			
25		25	! }		
	MARY AGNES DRURY, RPR - Official Court Report	ter	MARY AGNI	ES DRURY, RPR - Official Co	ourt Reporter

	A1223	
	21 [1] 148/5	75/6 76/5 76/9 78/3 82/5 82/6 83/2 84/11
	233 [1] 1/16	84/12 86/3 88/14 89/21 90/10 91/2 91/18
x [2] 1/2 1/6	24 [4] 8/25 26/15 26/15 89/10	91/23 92/4 92/4 92/16 92/17 92/19 93/25
	240 [2] 21/23 22/3	96/17 98/1 98/12 99/20 100/2 101/3 102/7
20.141.22.42	2480 1 2/2	102/24 104/11 104/20 104/21 105/16 107/14
.38 [1] 23/13	24th [1] 131/13	107/16 108/24 109/21 110/2 110/5 110/13
0	25 [1] 1/7 25 6 - 4 21 7 / 12 82 2	110/20 111/5 111/13 111/24 112/20 113/10
0045 [1] 98/6	25 feet [2] 76/12 82/3 250 [3] 21/23 22/3 99/6	114/21 115/1 117/19 118/5 125/7 125/16 137/19 138/13 139/12 141/22 142/19 146/6
02714 [1] 1/4	250 5 21/25 22/3 33/0 2582 1 2/2	above [4] 6/19 7/4 24/3 96/22
0839 [1] 38/17	2714 [1] 3/7	absence [5] 136/3 143/3 143/12 143/15
1	275 [1] 14/14	144/23
	¹ 28 [1] 148/6	absolute [3] 12/17 13/8 13/12
1,500 [1] 22/8	282 1] 14/14	absolutely [4] 12/25 14/7 84/7 99/24
1-A [1] 101/18 1-B 1 101/18	2:35 [1] 37/13	Academy [1] 53/22
10 [7] 6/24 19/13 57/9 144/12 144/13 146/10	3	accepted [1] 55/8 accident [1] 119/23
148/23	33 [1] 75/15	according [3] 37/18 103/1 120/23
10 feet [1] 80/7	373 1 14/13	accordingly [1] 127/9
10 inches [1] 24/9	374 [2] 138/1 142/1	accountable [8] 75/25 79/8 88/3 92/18 93/16
10-CV-02714 [1] 1/4	38 [2] 26/7 55/23	112/23 112/24 113/17
10-CV-2714 [1] 3/7	3A [3] 130/7 130/9 130/11	accredited [1] 53/25
10-inches [1] 46/23	4	accuracy [1] 126/23
100 1 1/23 10007 1 1/23		accurate [4] 6/21 13/15 107/7 125/2
1007 [1] 1/23	4/26/12 [1] 147/16 41 [1] 147/15	accused [2] 16/5 124/5
10:30 [1] 145/9	41 (1) 147/13 42 11 118/21	Acevedo [2] 37/10 37/10 acknowledged [1] 84/19
11 [9] 99/5 133/24 145/7 145/8 145/9 145/11	4:30 11 131/1	across 1 76/8
146/3 146/4 146/7	4:40 [1] 147/3	act 7 119/21 119/25 124/15 125/14 125/15
11:00 [2] 147/5 147/17	4A [1] 7/8	125/15 125/18
11:27 [1] 67/22	4B [1] 7/8	acted [5] 106/4 119/13 124/7 127/17 127/24
11:30 [1] 145/11	5	acting [3] 119/2 119/15 120/3
[12 [2] 12/16 147/16 [123 [1] 138/3	50 [4] 52/13 55/12 68/4 87/13	action [4] 14/24 28/22 28/24 59/4
124 1] 142/1	50 4 32/13 33/12 06/4 6 //13 50/50 1 87/13	actionable [1] 12/5
125 [1] 138/3	51/65 [1] 148/9	actions 4 12/25 117/17 123/6 126/6 activity 2 13/5 13/11
12:30 [1] 93/23	58 [1] 72/23	acts [6] 10/23 119/19 120/21 124/4 124/5
12:45 [1] 98/6	58/66 [1] 148/10	125/11
13 [2] 130/9 130/11	5A [1] 7/9	actual [5] 72/23 72/25 73/9 75/15 111/16
13 years [2] 32/5 43/23	5B [1] 7/11	actually [54] 11/2 14/2 31/3 32/12 33/2 33/5
14 3 7/3 17/23 37/12 147 1 135/22	6	46/9 59/14 60/2 61/2 61/3 72/19 73/13 74/17
147 11 133/22 15	6 a.m [3] 37/5 38/6 103/17	76/4 76/6 76/9 77/5 77/16 78/9 80/4 80/6
15 minutes [1] 33/6	613-2480 [1] 2/2	80/18 81/12 81/21 82/11 82/15 82/24 83/3 83/10 83/12 87/11 88/7 88/10 88/17 89/11
150 feet [1] 76/8	613-2582 [1] 2/2	90/6 91/7 91/10 92/4 92/7 92/25 93/15
153 [1] 135/23	65 [1] 148/9	102/22 104/2 110/3 111/3 111/17 112/2
15th [3] 22/22 71/4 120/9	66 [2] 80/21 148/10	112/13 114/10 125/16 136/18 136/22
16 [4] 133/24 134/19 134/20 134/20	7	add [3] 6/25 7/9 10/13
17 [2] 133/25 135/5	718 2 2/2 2/2	added [3] 13/18 15/5 15/22
17th [1] 131/20 18 [1] 133/25	77 9 23/1 23/2 23/3 25/2 33/9 33/13 34/17	addition [8] 10/20 12/18 13/17 52/5 52/7
1800 [1] 1/16	34/24 39/1	52/18 53/10 55/15 additional [4] 10/5 11/16 127/12 144/1
19 [1] 45/9	7th [1] 40/15	address [3] 10/4 110/6 136/7
1983 [7] 11/19 12/5 12/17 12/22 118/21	8	addressing [1] 95/16
136/2 145/1		adheres [1] 25/13
1998 [1] 135/23 1:15 [1] 94/5	83rd [1] 103/12 84th [2] 21/15 22/18	adjourned [1] 147/16
11:15 [1] 94/5 [1:20 [1] 95/3	8:30 1 33/13	admit [4] 49/14 74/5 74/9 87/11
1:53 [1] 113/24	8:30 a.m [1] 34/25	admits [2] 74/6 82/15
2	8:39 [1] 38/20	admitted [4] 87/2 96/19 133/15 133/16 admonish [1] 16/16
	9	adopt [1] 89/24
2-A [1] 105/13		adopted [1] 35/19
[2-B [2] 105/14 105/14	93 [2] 138/2 142/1 9:30 [1] 1/8	advance [2] 60/7 61/8
2-foot-high [1] 25/8		advised [1] 69/8
20 [4] 62/2 62/11 62/11 72/24 2004 [2] 14/14 138/2	$ \mathbf{A} $	affirm [1] 130/18
2004 2 14/14 138/2 2006 1 61/3	a,m [8] 1/8 34/25 37/5 38/6 67/22 98/7	affirmative [2] 7/5 20/18
2008 [13] 22/22 30/11 36/23 50/25 55/21	103/17 147/17	affirmed [1] 143/7
57/9 61/2 66/23 71/4 87/24 101/19 102/9	ability [2] 111/8 117/19	affirms [1] 146/1
120/9	able [7] 3/21 14/2 17/12 65/2 89/17 114/6	after [19] 6/17 17/23 27/23 33/6 33/14 79/6 88/16 89/25 90/2 91/7 93/25 94/1 105/17
2009 [1] 86/3	114/7	88/16 89/25 90/2 91/7 93/25 94/1 105/17 106/14 109/1 115/2 126/19 128/12 140/15
2011 [1] 66/25	about [79] 15/17 15/22 17/11 17/12 22/1	afternoon [2] 95/6 95/7
2012 [1] 1/7	26/16 30/3 40/19 41/15 59/11 61/14 62/5	again [27] 15/4 15/8 38/1 41/15 42/5 42/9
20th [1] 131/16	62/6 62/22 63/2 71/16 72/5 72/22 73/14 75/2	

Case: 12-2479 Document: 40-1 Page: 32 09/27/2012 731928 126

A1226

angle [1] 76/16 105/13 107/22 108/24 109/19 109/25 112/3 annex [9] 23/1 23/3 25/2 33/9 33/13 34/17 113/12 113/14 113/18 113/19 115/4 115/12 again... [21] 43/1 43/17 69/14 75/14 82/17 34/24 39/1 40/15 115/12 117/13 118/14 118/20 119/1 121/16 another [20] 5/13 38/8 44/7 53/1 54/6 67/1 86/9 86/10 88/24 90/20 98/3 99/4 99/15 123/2 123/3 123/16 124/8 125/24 128/4 106/22 107/10 108/9 108/12 109/6 112/11 128/24 130/16 133/14 133/15 134/2 134/14 73/16 79/6 79/18 81/14 88/9 97/23 97/23 138/6 140/17 141/12 97/25 98/10 98/23 98/25 121/17 139/21 136/13 138/5 138/8 143/3 147/9 against [20] 3/7 6/4 13/4 15/15 58/9 69/6 141/22 area [4] 46/8 84/10 84/11 89/9 69/23 87/5 115/24 118/22 118/25 121/22 answer [44] 5/6 7/3 17/24 30/16 32/19 33/1 areas [5] 27/15 27/17 27/18 27/20 44/13 123/2 123/6 124/10 127/16 128/2 128/4 42/4 47/3 47/3 49/23 50/19 61/23 64/7 64/9 aren't [2] 43/21 73/7 argue [5] 15/1 15/19 16/7 17/12 17/14 129/21 129/22 65/4 65/6 67/8 72/7 72/8 72/10 72/14 72/23 agency [1] 54/6 73/1 75/18 79/11 80/24 80/25 89/22 91/4 argument |8| 3/25 16/19 16/25 88/6 91/3 ago [14] 30/7 31/20 41/17 63/3 83/21 95/17 91/5 91/15 97/14 97/16 97/18 97/19 101/11 92/1 93/4 109/20 95/25 95/25 99/15 109/17 109/19 109/21 101/20 116/20 117/7 128/24 129/16 141/7 around [8] 21/23 22/8 24/9 33/13 61/8 85/6 144/12 145/12 85/9 132/16 agree [7] 43/9 43/10 77/6 116/20 141/10 answered |3| 42/2 97/9 117/6 arrest [46] 4/12 7/23 9/13 9/23 28/8 33/6 141/15 144/18 68/5 68/8 68/18 68/19 77/4 78/16 91/22 92/7 answering [8] 34/3 34/5 37/14 37/17 37/21 agreed [5] 73/4 77/9 130/22 136/15 138/22 37/23 37/25 38/1 92/9 96/12 96/14 96/20 98/7 101/9 101/11 agrees [1] 13/22 answers [3] 89/23 91/16 129/15 103/11 103/23 105/17 106/22 113/15 115/18 ahead |3| 61/22 82/3 89/11 116/16 116/17 120/25 121/1 121/3 121/4 anti [1] 23/4 aided [1] 2/5 anti-crime [1] 23/4 121/8 121/13 121/15 121/20 121/23 122/1 all [98] 3/2 5/15 6/6 6/16 6/17 7/3 9/19 14/3 Anticrime [1] 101/4 122/4 122/8 122/9 122/11 128/25 129/2 14/22 16/7 17/24 18/8 36/12 36/15 45/13 any [72] 7/1 9/23 10/9 12/17 12/21 16/1 138/7 45/19 47/9 49/1 52/17 55/14 58/25 60/25 17/17 18/23 19/18 30/10 36/13 47/19 51/1 arrested [12] 90/23 100/19 101/8 101/18 66/12 66/12 67/18 67/18 68/5 70/20 72/13 51/3 51/5 53/21 54/15 54/21 56/20 62/5 62/6 103/25 116/4 120/3 120/8 120/9 120/11 72/16 78/7 78/13 78/13 78/14 80/4 80/12 65/22 66/1 67/13 67/15 70/8 75/12 80/22 139/20 140/12 83/10 83/11 83/13 84/6 85/6 85/8 85/20 86/1 82/10 83/8 85/21 88/4 90/4 93/6 93/8 93/12 arresting [9] 42/12 71/22 77/1 77/2 77/3 86/12 87/4 88/2 88/24 89/23 90/4 91/1 91/5 96/17 97/16 97/19 97/21 106/7 107/11 111/1 82/9 82/19 86/8 109/25 91/16 91/23 93/17 94/3 100/5 100/14 104/23 114/20 114/23 115/1 119/3 119/4 119/6 arrests [1] 89/12 107/20 109/20 111/3 111/8 113/5 113/6 119/8 119/23 122/12 125/25 126/5 126/17 arrive [1] 43/4 113/12 114/2 114/7 115/9 116/19 116/24 126/18 127/6 127/8 128/1 129/16 129/17 arrived [6] 25/2 34/24 38/11 38/21 39/5 129/23 135/20 137/9 138/9 139/12 141/17 117/21 118/3 118/13 120/22 121/21 123/22 128/3 129/15 132/1 132/3 132/5 132/23 143/1 143/17 144/5 145/12 147/7 as [141] 3/17 4/2 4/9 4/16 4/18 4/23 5/8 5/17 133/16 133/17 134/14 134/15 135/7 135/12 anybody [3] 64/1 128/7 139/12 7/7 8/12 9/16 10/17 10/21 12/2 12/18 13/6 139/10 140/12 141/10 141/15 141/21 145/19 anyone [3] 17/18 78/23 147/6 13/14 14/4 14/7 14/21 17/22 20/24 21/18 145/23 147/9 147/12 anything [15] 9/7 11/20 15/20 16/10 17/10 21/20 27/10 31/17 32/11 33/11 34/22 35/8 alleged [2] 60/11 124/3 33/10 33/16 62/22 78/4 80/19 90/6 91/9 35/23 37/25 42/2 45/6 45/23 49/2 51/10 52/7 allow [5] 25/25 43/16 49/18 65/15 66/9 114/22 118/1 128/10 52/8 52/24 53/1 53/19 53/19 55/8 55/18 58/1 allowed [2] 69/24 112/5 anyway [2] 87/13 110/18 62/1 62/7 63/2 63/2 63/6 63/22 64/19 66/17 alma [1] 53/20 66/17 68/6 68/6 69/3 69/4 71/8 71/15 71/17 anywhere [1] 77/12 almost [5] 72/6 107/24 109/12 109/13 apart [1] 86/12 71/25 71/25 72/2 75/18 75/20 82/17 83/25 117/10 apparently [1] 144/6 85/13 86/15 91/9 92/25 95/11 95/11 95/24 alone [1] 89/3 97/12 97/20 98/5 101/2 103/24 104/15 106/5 Appeals [2] 12/19 14/9 along [5] 83/11 83/13 90/9 111/3 114/3 appearance |1| 56/12 106/12 106/25 107/21 110/7 112/7 114/9 alongside [1] 8/1 appeared [5] 52/11 69/16 79/17 79/17 114/16 115/8 115/11 117/11 117/25 118/8 aiready [8] 4/21 38/22 38/22 42/2 62/14 118/12 118/14 118/14 118/24 120/2 121/20 117/16 104/15 114/15 125/4 appearing [1] 52/8 126/7 126/14 126/15 126/23 126/25 126/25 also [30] 10/14 19/21 31/8 39/8 39/13 39/18 applicable [1] 14/3 127/1 127/14 127/18 131/8 131/10 131/14 40/14 41/13 48/10 49/11 50/3 50/23 53/18 applying [1] 118/12 131/18 131/22 133/6 133/7 133/19 133/20 56/22 59/16 59/25 64/16 69/13 74/10 78/3 appointment [1] 145/10 135/11 135/13 135/16 135/24 135/24 139/4 80/14 95/13 99/13 100/4 108/5 111/13 appreciate [1] 132/7 139/18 140/15 140/15 141/25 141/25 142/25 112/10 118/13 127/10 127/23 approach [10] 4/6 5/9 7/20 7/24 7/25 8/5 8/7 142/25 143/4 143/23 144/8 144/13 144/21 alternative |2| 4/8 8/10 144/24 145/2 145/18 146/10 23/17 36/25 143/16 although [1] 6/10 aside [1] 114/20 approaching [1] 8/14 always [1] 107/22 appropriate [5] 5/16 15/19 17/3 69/7 138/23 ask [31] 8/1 9/15 14/18 16/18 17/5 35/22 am |5| 21/9 52/2 61/17 85/21 126/1 37/21 61/19 61/23 62/12 62/22 66/14 69/23 approve [1] 62/20 ambiguous [1] 12/9 approximate [1] 33/8 82/10 93/16 103/24 104/23 105/12 105/15 amenable |1| 27/7 approximately [15] 21/22 21/24 22/6 24/8 106/10 106/23 112/5 113/11 113/20 114/11 amend |1| 14/18 26/14 33/5 33/13 34/24 46/22 46/24 52/13 128/10 130/22 132/15 135/7 141/10 144/2 Amendment [1] 120/10 52/22 55/5 55/12 88/15 asked [17] 4/1 4/13 8/4 42/1 65/18 66/1 72/6 American [2] 53/22 143/21 approximation [1] 22/2 73/2 74/10 78/3 97/5 97/8 97/13 100/15 among [2] 121/14 146/5 April [5] 1/7 8/25 131/13 131/16 131/20 108/18 128/16 128/19 asking [8] 8/17 73/15 85/21 85/21 88/2 amount [12] 7/10 28/2 56/15 56/17 56/24 April 17th [1] 131/20 63/13 63/14 63/17 99/19 111/4 116/8 128/5 April 20th [1] 131/16 127/10 135/12 137/21 amounts [2] 18/22 60/20 April 24th [1] 131/13 asks [1] 38/3 analyses [1] 22/7 are [101] 6/11 8/1 8/2 11/7 12/3 12/4 15/17 assaults [2] 52/16 57/3 analysis [15] 21/25 27/25 52/6 54/15 54/18 21/11 21/16 24/24 26/3 27/7 28/16 30/21 assess [3] 128/1 128/3 129/17 54/19 54/22 55/1 55/4 55/6 55/9 55/19 55/22 30/25 31/4 32/20 33/17 33/19 33/21 34/6 assessed [1] 128/4 82/19 82/24 34/10 38/22 40/10 43/19 47/15 49/1 51/18 assigned [2] 21/11 21/12 analyst [3] 52/25 53/11 54/20 51/20 52/8 53/21 54/3 54/7 57/22 59/4 60/13 assist [2] 114/16 123/25 analysts [1] 18/21 60/20 62/7 65/11 65/17 66/22 71/5 72/6 72/6 assistance |1| 123/12 analyze [3] 37/7 70/7 117/9 73/18 77/21 79/3 79/3 81/6 81/19 84/4 84/18 Assistant [1] 53/15 analyzed [1] 27/24 85/7 87/13 87/13 89/10 90/12 90/18 90/22 associate [10] 53/22 68/15 89/25 100/3

92/5 92/6 95/23 99/14 100/6 100/8 101/1

100/3 100/5 100/6 102/17 102/17 103/2

anchoring [1] 143/14

A1227

associate's [1] 102/25 associations [1] 53/21 assume [1] 120/19 assuming [2] 37/15 139/16 attach [1] 25/10 attack [3] 12/24 95/19 96/11 attempt [3] 44/10 97/7 117/12 attempts [1] 17/17 attention [10] 11/2 22/21 39/12 55/21 59/6 70/16 89/10 95/9 95/12 109/6 attorney [9] 1/22 73/8 73/16 73/18 105/24 111/14 111/19 122/20 124/14 attorney's [6] 53/16 53/19 68/24 104/19 105/18 105/25 attorneys [9] 1/15 70/6 88/16 91/24 114/15 129/23 132/16 141/13 142/14 attributable [2] 129/19 129/20 audit [1] 54/7 aunt's [1] 110/19 available [2] 42/24 43/3 award [19] 126/4 127/11 127/11 127/18 127/19 127/20 127/23 135/18 137/10 137/22 139/5 141/6 143/4 143/6 143/9 143/12 143/14 143/14 143/19 awardable [1] 143/3 awarded [3] 7/10 136/3 144/22 awarding [1] 126/21 awards [2] 136/4 140/1 aware [9] 28/24 29/2 32/23 59/20 84/19 110/19 122/5 122/6 122/19 away [9] 64/4 76/6 76/8 76/12 76/18 80/7 85/3 87/16 87/23

B-U-C-K-L-E-Y [1] 13/1 Bachelor's [1] 53/4 back [24] 27/19 46/7 46/11 46/21 54/25 64/19 69/23 70/9 70/24 71/16 71/21 76/10 76/12 93/24 100/5 100/7 100/20 103/13 103/14 126/9 128/9 128/9 141/9 146/4 background [2] 72/17 114/22 backgrounds [2] 118/11 118/15 |backwards [1] 81/12 bad [1] 78/19 bag [1] 137/3 balanced [1] 115/13 Baltimore [3] 52/19 53/1 55/16 bar [3] 129/23 130/2 130/4 barrel [4] 44/15 44/16 44/17 83/5 base [1] 24/24 based [18] 6/16 12/17 21/14 23/5 25/25 26/2 68/17 69/2 69/14 69/16 69/16 114/19 115/21 bothered [1] 83/5 123/22 127/21 141/24 142/5 144/19 basic [3] 81/18 81/20 143/21 basically [2] 53/9 138/17 basing [1] 18/24 basis |4| 8/13 18/23 24/18 124/20 Bates [1] 45/11 be [153] because [61] 9/21 13/24 16/8 30/10 30/25 32/8 32/24 37/16 37/19 39/5 41/8 42/25 69/14 71/11 76/18 77/14 77/25 78/19 78/20 81/14 82/1 82/23 82/25 86/7 86/8 86/9 86/10 briefed [1] 143/1 86/12 87/25 88/19 90/13 91/12 95/22 96/12 99/1 101/8 103/16 103/21 103/22 104/8 104/9 106/17 106/19 107/17 107/25 108/7 108/10 111/25 115/4 115/18 118/14 119/22 121/8 126/1 129/16 141/2 141/13 142/18 143/18 143/20 145/19 become [1] 53/7 been [50] 4/22 9/21 10/16 15/8 15/9 15/12

20/23 24/25 29/3 35/8 41/3 51/9 52/22 54/4 | BRT [1] 52/25 55/2 55/8 56/20 57/25 58/8 58/20 60/23 61/8 brutish [1] 108/1 63/24 63/25 64/1 65/18 68/16 69/18 70/16 78/25 83/13 85/3 86/4 87/22 96/9 100/19 100/20 100/21 105/10 112/23 112/24 113/9 120/5 121/9 143/4 143/8 143/10 143/14 143/18 143/22 before [27] 1/10 5/23 6/8 9/1 19/8 33/16 52/25 59/8 69/25 70/13 71/16 72/16 79/17 80/17 80/22 83/19 85/3 93/10 102/18 104/2 106/6 118/9 122/1 136/8 137/17 144/2 145/7 began [2] 52/24 56/8 begin [2] 128/6 141/12 beginning [5] 6/25 8/21 87/1 98/15 142/1 behalf [2] 70/14 95/10 beheld [1] 122/23 being [16] 9/21 16/5 17/12 25/13 51/12 58/9 58/9 59/24 64/19 64/22 72/6 92/16 97/12 112/18 121/12 136/23 belief [4] 69/17 69/17 101/13 121/12 believe [34] 6/9 6/10 8/21 8/25 9/20 12/7 14/23 28/20 28/23 31/4 31/12 44/1 44/23 74/25 87/20 90/5 91/7 91/10 91/14 95/20 96/15 107/6 107/17 108/9 109/5 112/4 118/11 123/17 134/17 134/25 137/1 138/12 138/16 144/9 believed [5] 83/14 90/7 101/13 111/6 123/24 buy [1] 79/4 believes [1] 8/12 bench [4] 3/5 95/2 130/5 147/1 best [2] 70/19 78/22 better [2] 88/18 112/9 between [5] 26/14 58/10 81/7 145/9 145/11 beyond [3] 79/14 101/24 131/1 big [4] 83/12 88/20 98/16 98/17 biochemistry [1] 53/12 biology [3] 51/24 53/4 53/12 bit [2] 85/5 110/1 black [1] 24/7 blame [1] 78/6 blank [5] 73/3 78/3 96/15 96/16 96/25 blow [1] 83/16 blowup [4] 134/4 134/12 134/20 135/6 blowups [4] 114/8 133/14 133/17 134/16 boasts [1] 61/14 Bode [1] 52/24 bolster [1] 88/18 book [11] 45/18 78/17 78/23 78/25 79/3 98/2 98/3 98/6 98/9 135/2 135/3 boroughs [2] 52/17 55/15 both [14] 13/25 52/17 53/16 68/6 87/5 87/6 87/10 100/19 117/7 121/15 123/23 126/25 128/2 132/8 bother [2] 49/11 49/24 bottom [8] 6/24 13/18 25/11 35/17 35/18 50/25 84/7 90/17 box [9] 36/25 38/3 38/8 38/16 39/8 39/11 77/6 82/13 82/14 boxes [4] 36/20 36/22 39/13 39/20 breach [1] 138/18 break [6] 67/19 67/21 89/22 93/24 93/25 brief [10] 3/10 3/18 3/19 5/20 7/17 7/18 99/17 109/13 131/6 138/8 briefly [5] 3/23 7/14 16/13 65/23 90/19 bring [8] 60/10 70/2 124/3 136/5 138/15 138/24 139/1 145/6 bringing [1] 125/16 Broadway [1] 1/16 Bronx [1] 53/19 Brooklyn [5] 1/6 21/12 21/15 43/21 101/4

brought [1] 115/24

Buckley [1] 13/1 buddy [1] 86/18 build [2] 46/25 47/1 building [2] 1/15 23/5 bulging [1] 76/8 bullet [1] 112/18 bullets [17] 24/4 26/23 46/20 48/17 48/21 49/12 49/15 49/25 50/4 50/9 50/15 50/18 83/8 83/9 112/14 112/14 112/16 bump [1] 26/9 bumpy [1] 26/5 bunch [1] 87/9 Burbridge [36] 3/9 6/5 6/7 28/9 29/4 32/24 40/22 41/13 41/24 42/3 48/20 68/11 68/23 79/15 81/13 88/21 89/20 89/22 95/11 99/8 100/18 102/12 103/7 103/25 105/7 105/14 109/8 112/2 118/23 125/12 129/2 129/6 129/12 129/19 129/21 129/22 burden [14] 92/7 92/9 92/10 92/12 92/13 106/4 115/7 115/13 115/14 116/14 116/16 122/8 122/9 125/19 burglaries [2] 21/18 31/5 business [3] 35/6 66/24 79/9 busy [1] 78/12 buying [1] 79/3

C-A-T-T-A-R-A-U-G-U-S [1] 135/22 C1 [2] 23/20 134/7 caliber [1] 55/23 call [10] 20/19 20/20 22/24 34/4 83/19 83/20 88/22 90/18 128/9 141/14 called [26] 12/23 30/22 30/25 31/1 31/4 33/3 33/5 34/19 44/21 49/2 49/2 51/1 51/9 56/22 58/20 59/3 59/6 59/24 62/23 63/24 63/25 64/1 77/6 88/25 118/21 143/19 Calling [1] 3/6 callous [1] 127/22 eame [10] 73/12 76/2 77/14 85/3 85/17 89/23 100/13 100/24 110/23 112/7 camera [2] 24/16 24/17 can [84] 3/24 6/17 8/15 12/2 14/18 14/21 15/1 15/19 16/7 19/2 19/8 19/13 20/9 22/2 30/16 32/11 37/1 37/8 38/8 38/18 40/24 42/4 46/2 46/5 46/9 47/3 53/3 53/24 60/13 61/15 65/12 66/13 67/6 70/15 70/19 72/2 75/23 75/24 75/25 79/7 79/8 79/22 80/9 83/24 84/6 84/14 84/22 92/25 93/3 93/5 93/8 93/12 99/4 99/25 110/2 110/8 110/20 111/20 114/15 117/15 117/22 118/3 120/19 120/22 124/7 125/13 126/9 128/10 132/11 132/15 132/22 135/18 137/17 137/21 139/5 140/1 140/2 140/2 141/1 141/5 142/16 143/12 145/12 147/14 can't [19] 13/25 14/1 14/12 59/20 72/10 72/13 74/5 74/9 74/18 81/18 81/20 81/24 93/15 97/18 104/8 107/13 109/17 145/7 146/2 cannot [10] 16/18 69/3 93/15 105/2 105/3 107/11 122/22 140/8 140/18 144/22 capacity [3] 5/25 52/8 52/12 capital [1] 77/20 car [12] 76/10 79/24 80/7 80/7 84/13 84/20 84/21 84/22 85/1 85/2 86/16 100/13 care [1] 110/20 career [3] 47/8 52/24 89/13 careful [3] 47/20 95/9 95/12 carefully [4] 70/8 85/22 93/18 109/4 Carriere [1] 14/13 carrying [3] 71/7 100/7 100/9

	•	
C	circled 2 48/1 48/2	86/16 90/12 100/6 100/8 commenced [1] 123/9
cartridges [13] 24/3 24/4 26/22 26/25 27/6	Circuit 10 6/10 6/11 14/8 14/14 135/21 135/23 137/1 137/2 137/4 138/2	commencement [1] 123/5
27/7 46/16 50/21 50/23 64/22 64/25 65/3	circumstances [9] 9/19 13/14 42/22 43/5	commit [3] 16/4 16/5 86/22
65/5	122/13 123/15 126/23 129/14 130/14	committed [4] 9/21 119/15 121/12 123/18
case [124] 4/20 8/2 8/9 12/1 14/22 15/9	circumvented [1] 12/19	committing [1] 101/14
15/15 18/13 18/17 19/4 22/22 25/11 26/8	citation [1] 137/24	common [6] 76/21 84/11 85/14 85/25 113/13
27/3 28/1 30/3 31/14 32/16 32/20 33/2 34/22	cite [2] 137/3 143/11	126/22
35/15 38/22 38/24 40/7 40/19 46/20 52/6	cited [1] 141/25	communicate [3] 117/1 128/6 128/9
56/9 57/14 57/15 57/20 58/21 58/25 59/7 59/12 59/14 59/20 60/19 61/9 62/25 64/1	Citing [1] 13/1 citizen [1] 119/6	company [1] 55/2 compelled [1] 14/10
64/4 66/18 66/22 68/6 68/7 70/17 70/18	city [12] 1/5 1/22 3/7 16/24 17/2 21/9 52/18	compensate [1] 126/5
70/21 71/1 71/2 71/3 71/7 71/21 71/23 75/2	52/19 55/15 55/16 83/4 136/11	compensation 2 136/21 137/11
76/21 77/22 79/5 82/22 82/23 83/6 83/16	civil [9] 3/6 12/24 28/21 28/24 76/2 79/18	compensatory [32] 7/7 15/21 92/14 126/3
83/17 83/22 86/2 86/4 86/7 86/11 86/12	118/22 118/24 118/25	126/8 126/21 127/11 129/19 135/19 136/1
86/25 87/12 88/14 88/17 88/20 89/15 89/18	claim [34] 12/17 12/22 12/24 13/3 16/11	136/3 136/12 138/12 138/14 139/6 139/23
90/4 91/23 92/3 92/16 92/16 92/17 94/1 95/13 95/15 96/3 101/1 101/2 101/3 101/7	68/5 68/19 68/23 69/5 79/5 82/4 92/13 101/9	140/2 140/3 140/8 140/16 140/18 140/19 141/1 141/3 141/6 143/3 143/6 143/9 143/13
101/23 101/23 101/24 102/1 106/20 107/15	101/9 101/10 102/6 104/2 104/11 104/12 104/18 104/21 106/3 106/25 107/9 115/10	143/15 143/20 144/23
110/3 112/9 112/15 114/16 115/2 115/10	116/16 118/24 119/12 120/7 124/14 124/17	complained [1] 119/15
116/2 116/19 117/14 117/21 121/21 122/9	124/18 124/23 136/21	complaint [13] 78/4 78/5 78/6 78/11 78/16
128/2 136/18 136/23 137/3 137/14 137/15	claimed [5] 111/3 120/20 122/16 122/17	82/12 98/13 111/16 111/16 111/18 111/19
137/16 138/13 138/16 141/25 142/6 143/2	126/14	134/23 135/4
143/16 147/6	claiming [4] 12/19 32/24 83/11 106/25	complete [4] 85/24 134/18 134/19 138/8
cases 22 6/10 6/11 13/3 16/24 21/22 21/23 52/14 52/15 52/16 54/9 54/13 54/16 57/2	claims [13] 5/4 6/25 44/8 80/15 88/19 92/10 115/17 116/15 118/20 120/8 125/24 126/4	completed [1] 103/15 completely [6] 64/4 71/11 72/8 79/16 93/14
59/19 60/23 71/5 114/10 136/2 141/24	126/15	112/1
142/25 143/10 145/1	clarification [1] 7/11	component [2] 106/2 106/3
casings 1 46/16	clarified [2] 144/3 145/20	Computer [1] 2/5
CASTRO [3] 1/25 51/17 65/25	clasp [1] 25/10	Computer-aided [1] 2/5
Cattaraugus [1] 135/22 caught 1] 100/9	clause [2] 11/9 11/16	computerized 1 2/5
cause 49 5/1 6/14 6/16 6/19 9/12 9/18 9/22	clean [1] 88/23 clear [10] 4/18 16/11 67/3 72/5 102/23	conceal [1] 85/7 concentration [1] 75/4
9/24 13/19 14/17 14/20 59/3 68/8 68/18	115/15 116/12 127/3 135/21 147/7	concerning [1] 12/22
101/11 101/12 102/8 103/23 104/15 106/22	clearly [3] 12/2 85/17 142/12	conclude [2] 88/13 110/11
110/8 110/10 110/21 116/15 116/17 119/19	client [4] 15/24 16/16 95/10 136/14	conclusion [2] 50/12 109/5
121/2 121/4 121/8 121/15 121/16 121/19	cling [1] 96/7	conclusions [1] 3/23
121/23 122/3 122/8 122/9 123/4 123/11 123/14 123/20 123/22 123/25 124/10 124/12	close [2] 19/4 97/21 closest [1] 97/17	conducive [3] 26/6 26/10 27/10 conduct [9] 54/21 55/22 55/25 56/1 119/14
124/15 125/12 125/13 130/19 139/19	closing [8] 4/20 5/10 5/14 16/25 17/17 91/3	119/16 122/3 125/22 127/15
caused [4] 125/14 126/6 140/10 140/22	95/5 109/11	conducted [3] 22/13 22/14 56/4
causes [1] 119/6	closings 1 117/13	conducting [1] 13/5
causing [1] 125/16	CLR [1] 2/1	conferred [3] 40/15 40/17 40/21
cell 1 27/16 centra 1 71/3	co [4] 3/13 3/17 95/11 101/2 co-counsel [4] 3/13 3/17 95/11 101/2	confine [1] 120/11 confinement [5] 120/14 120/15 120/16
certain [2] 38/23 76/5	Code [1] 118/21	120/17 138/10
certainly [2] 12/9 137/16	COHEN [5] 1/14 1/18 58/17 66/6 66/16	conflicted [1] 81/4
certified [1] 66/25	coherent [1] 70/25	conflicts [1] 81/7
cetera [1] 140/12	cold [1] 58/2	confuse 1 14/4
challenge 1 14/2	colleagues 1 74/12 collect 11 21/20 25/2 25/3 31/1 31/0 31/14	confused [1] 145/21
challenging [1] 5/14	collect [11] 21/20 25/2 25/3 31/1 31/9 31/14 34/14 40/6 42/25 43/6 47/17	confusing [6] 5/19 6/1 6/11 144/2 144/5 145/22
chance [5] 82/25 90/21 96/20 98/3 113/2	collected [14] 27/13 27/14 27/22 34/8 39/14	confusion [3] 144/3 145/21 145/25
change [13] 5/2 5/21 7/11 10/5 17/9 26/16	39/20 40/22 41/2 41/19 41/21 41/21 42/6	connecting [1] 84/8
75/7 76/15 79/10 80/11 81/5 90/3 128/12	42/11 103/19	connection [2] 45/2 59/24
changed [1] 76/16 changes [4] 3/24 6/18 10/2 73/10	collection [22] 21/12 21/14 21/17 22/9 22/10 22/12 22/17 26/13 30/22 33/17 33/19 33/21	conscience [1] 90/13 conscious [2] 119/25 120/14
changes [4] 3/24 0/16 10/2 /3/10 changing [5] 84/3 85/23 86/9 86/10 109/22	33/23 34/13 35/12 35/14 41/8 41/16 42/9	consent [1] 120/15
charge [17] 4/18 5/21 9/16 10/14 13/14 16/8	42/13 44/2 98/22	consequence [1] 125/18
17/8 17/12 18/9 18/12 69/2 69/16 94/3	College [2] 53/4 53/20	consequences [1] 120/1
113/23 131/6 137/7 139/4	color [4] 119/2 119/3 119/15 120/3	consider [11] 10/17 109/4 113/5 115/2 116/8
charged [1] 71/8	Columbia [1] 119/5	117/15 117/22 118/7 120/22 121/20 141/9
charges [5] 16/3 106/19 115/21 121/22 124/10	combined 1 4/25 come 30 22/23 23/14 24/15 34/14 37/7	consideration [2] 115/6 126/25 considerations [1] 118/13
check [4] 98/23 98/23 103/24 105/15	44/2 54/6 69/23 70/22 72/12 78/1 79/3 79/12	considered [4] 10/23 120/4 120/5 120/22
checked [3] 40/2 82/14 99/8	79/13 80/4 80/6 80/15 84/6 90/18 100/7	considering [2] 115/9 128/13
checks [1] 37/14	104/20 109/4 109/18 115/1 128/17 130/4	consist [1] 56/6
Chicago [1] 53/6	135/7 141/12 146/4 146/7	consistent [5] 72/1 96/3 96/10 97/10 99/16
chief [9] 18/21 18/25 51/23 51/25 52/9 52/20		conspired [1] 12/20
53/24 68/6 68/7 chooses 1 84/16	72/13 72/15 74/20 82/14 84/22 89/4 89/16	constitution [5] 119/10 119/17 119/18
choses [1] 84/16 chosen [1] 15/13	100/5 128/15 136/8 comfortable [1] 92/12	120/10 124/22 constitutional [14] 116/1 116/6 119/1 120/6
Church [1] 1/23	coming [9] 76/19 84/19 84/20 85/2 85/12	124/18 124/19 129/9 129/13 130/12 136/12
	THE PARTY OF TAX OF THE COLUMN	

A1229

C constitutional... [4] 136/14 138/18 139/7 143/23 consult [2] 141/13 142/14 consulted [1] 69/8 contact [1] 44/10 contacted [1] 89/14 contains [1] 36/1 contaminate [1] 31/17 contaminates [1] 34/13 contend [1] 121/4 contends [1] 121/7 context [1] 17/4 continue [11] 12/12 17/24 49/9 92/1 93/4 93/25 104/25 124/10 130/25 145/8 146/3 continued [9] 1/10 29/6 67/23 94/7 113/25 123/2 123/9 126/19 146/13 continues [3] 81/11 124/1 124/2 contradict [1] 71/12 contradicted [1] 117/22 contradicts [1] 19/1 contrary [1] 143/21 contravention [2] 4/7 4/9 contribute [1] 57/22 control [1] 18/19 convenient [1] 130/20 conversation [2] 41/15 79/22 conversing [1] 44/6 cooperation [1] 132/7 cop [3] 85/1 85/2 86/16 copies |2| 90/20 94/4 cops [3] 84/18 86/19 90/10 copy [5] 45/14 45/15 60/9 60/10 66/25 corner [1] 38/11 correct [72] 5/10 5/11 14/5 28/19 28/22 29/4 29/5 30/5 30/6 30/11 30/23 31/6 31/7 31/10 32/9 32/13 32/18 33/7 34/8 34/17 34/22 35/3 critically [1] 117/14 36/20 36/23 38/4 39/6 39/18 40/4 41/8 41/11 criticize [1] 143/18 43/14 44/11 44/13 45/3 47/9 47/21 48/13 49/12 49/13 49/25 50/16 50/17 51/2 58/21 58/22 59/4 59/12 59/13 59/25 60/1 60/12 60/21 61/4 61/5 61/16 62/7 62/25 63/3 63/16 63/19 63/23 64/2 64/14 64/22 64/23 66/4 67/4 72/25 73/1 73/4 139/3 144/23 corrected [1] 97/15 corrections [1] 94/4 correctly [2] 7/21 14/4 corroborates [1] 68/12 cotton |1| 27/21 coughing [1] 99/18 could [27] 9/4 10/6 12/24 21/8 33/10 43/3 43/6 45/11 56/20 57/22 57/24 57/25 61/9 61/12 64/4 64/8 64/13 65/5 69/25 80/10 81/1 | curative [3] 4/8 4/23 8/9 85/19 86/11 108/18 110/22 136/7 138/1 couldn't [7] 89/22 97/20 108/7 109/21 135/19 138/20 143/20 counsel [25] 3/13 3/17 10/6 16/16 36/7 45/11 59/24 62/23 66/19 67/2 92/2 95/11 95/17 95/19 95/24 97/5 97/11 99/1 99/13 99/19 100/22 101/2 104/24 107/16 109/2 counsel's [1] 96/16 Counselor [1] 81/24 counsels [1] 63/25 count [1] 117/7 counts [1] 106/16 County [2] 53/19 135/22 course [24] 8/3 12/3 22/6 22/13 35/5 37/15 66/23 69/9 72/3 73/11 74/5 76/14 89/10 89/16 91/8 95/9 97/1 112/3 114/13 115/3 117/4 118/17 137/18 143/18 coursework [1] 53/11 court [62] 1/1 2/1 2/1 3/1 3/3 10/13 10/15

12/18 14/9 14/9 14/14 14/18 16/15 16/18 17/6 21/1 22/2 51/13 52/11 52/17 52/18 52/19 55/15 55/16 76/1 82/15 104/24 114/24 115/1 115/5 118/6 118/8 118/24 118/24 118/25 128/9 128/18 128/19 128/20 130/10 130/22 131/5 131/8 131/10 131/14 131/18 131/22 133/6 133/7 133/20 135/11 135/13 135/16 135/17 135/19 139/4 143/7 143/22 144/12 144/13 146/10 148/12 Court's [3] 4/7 4/10 5/5 courthouse [2] 1/5 145/9 courtroom [6] 67/22 71/13 95/3 113/24 142/17 147/3 courts [2] 55/13 55/14 cover [3] 84/10 88/12 88/13 covered [5] 84/2 84/3 84/4 84/5 84/9 CPW [1] 98/7 created [4] 14/1 107/3 124/25 132/24 creates [4] 6/13 13/19 14/15 123/19 creating [1] 126/7 credibility [11] 5/12 10/11 10/18 10/24 68/21 75/2 86/8 86/13 95/20 96/12 120/22 credible [4] 71/25 95/21 103/5 103/5 crime [20] 9/20 16/5 22/13 22/14 23/4 31/5 32/12 32/15 34/3 43/8 43/11 84/8 86/21 87/25 88/1 101/14 121/8 121/9 121/12 122/10 crimes [2] 34/2 52/16 criminal [25] 4/2 4/20 12/23 14/11 14/16 21/18 27/3 31/6 52/15 52/19 55/16 58/25 69/1 98/8 101/23 101/23 106/16 106/19 111/16 115/21 122/12 122/21 123/2 123/8 135/4 criminalist [4] 52/2 52/3 53/7 108/5 criminalists [1] 52/5 critical [6] 71/12 75/7 82/9 109/25 123/10 123/23 criticizing [1] 145/18 cross [15] 4/1 4/16 7/4 8/4 10/10 15/24 19/2 28/12 58/15 58/16 66/1 72/4 118/7 148/6 cross-examination [7] 10/10 15/24 19/2 28/12 58/16 66/1 72/4 cross-examinations [1] 8/4 cross-examine |2| 4/1 4/16 cross-examined [1] 118/7 Cross/Recross [1] 148/10 CRR [1] 2/1 crucial [1] 104/4 CSI [1] 107/20 culmination [1] 54/19 current [1] 21/8 currently [3] 21/9 51/20 65/7 custody [1] 121/3 custom [1] 119/4 CV [2] 1/4 3/7 cylinder [6] 27/20 44/23 46/12 46/14 46/15 64/20

D-E-Y-K-E-S [1] 13/2 D.A [2] 74/25 77/18 D.A.'s [1] 89/2 D1 [1] 134/5 damage [8] 125/14 125/17 138/12 143/4 143/5 143/9 143/14 143/19 damages [71] 4/17 7/7 7/9 7/10 15/22 16/25 17/4 92/15 92/23 92/24 116/9 116/11 119/10 119/20 125/19 125/24 126/1 126/2 126/3 126/5 126/7 126/8 126/11 126/20 126/21

127/1 127/6 127/10 127/11 127/12 127/19 127/20 127/24 128/1 128/1 128/3 128/4 129/17 129/19 129/21 136/1 136/1 136/3 136/13 137/9 137/22 138/10 138/14 138/17 138/17 138/19 138/25 139/9 139/13 139/23 140/8 140/16 140/18 140/19 143/3 143/4 143/6 143/8 143/12 143/13 143/15 143/15 143/24 144/22 144/23 145/1 dampness [1] 58/2 dangerous [1] 85/10 dark [5] 76/8 97/8 97/8 97/14 97/20 date [19] 24/11 24/13 24/15 24/16 57/6 57/9 112/22 131/6 131/9 131/11 131/15 131/19 131/23 133/8 133/21 135/14 135/16 144/14 146/11 dates [1] 54/25 Daubert [3] 18/13 18/16 19/4 day [7] 22/13 42/24 77/3 88/9 90/3 93/17 113/2 deal [3] 5/1 98/16 98/17 deals [1] 136/19 dealt [2] 4/21 5/6 decide [12] 71/1 82/23 86/6 87/7 103/4 104/13 114/23 116/19 117/12 121/1 139/25 141/4 decided [5] 80/23 88/17 106/15 114/17 115/2 deciding [4] 10/23 71/2 95/13 120/22 decision [12] 5/5 13/23 87/13 101/17 104/21 112/9 113/3 113/20 123/10 136/10 138/2 144/19 decisions [2] 14/8 85/22 decline [1] 13/7 deductive [1] 76/22 deemed [1] 121/16 defendant [40] 1/5 1/22 6/20 6/23 12/23 69/2 96/23 102/4 102/5 102/6 105/2 107/3 116/10 116/17 119/13 120/11 120/24 121/14 122/8 122/22 123/3 123/7 123/24 124/1 124/4 124/9 124/15 125/2 125/4 125/22 126/24 127/7 127/12 127/17 127/17 127/24 128/5 129/18 142/23 144/7 defendant's [14] 23/20 68/7 119/19 123/5 123/12 127/21 134/1 134/3 134/5 134/7 134/9 134/9 142/7 142/8 defendants [50] 1/21 4/1 4/7 4/11 4/13 4/15 4/19 4/23 5/3 7/12 7/15 7/22 7/25 10/14 10/18 12/6 14/24 15/6 15/10 20/20 51/9 68/4 68/5 69/9 89/17 90/23 92/7 93/1 93/6 93/21 99/15 107/6 107/9 109/7 115/20 115/20 115/25 115/25 120/2 120/8 120/18 121/4 121/15 122/18 124/14 124/16 124/24 127/8 128/2 132/19 defendants' [7] 3/10 3/20 7/19 8/8 15/24 99/20 126/6 defense [17] 16/16 36/7 59/24 62/23 63/25 66/18 67/2 67/17 83/20 88/14 88/14 88/16 88/23 92/2 95/5 108/16 142/24 definitely [1] 137/4 definitiveness [1] 126/22 degraded [1] 58/1 degree [1] 98/8 deliberately [4] 118/2 118/4 119/22 122/6 deliberating [2] 108/24 114/7 deliberations [6] 95/13 108/21 128/6 130/25 141/13 147/10 demeanor [1] 117/16 denial [1] 140/23 denied |9| 4/4 4/13 68/20 69/7 69/20 70/2 90/24 107/1 116/6 denies [1] 121/7 denigrating [1] 145/19 deny [2] 9/25 115/20

A1230

	A1230
D	disagree [3] 137/12 137/13 137/16
	disapproval [1] 127/14
department 4 1/22 21/10 51/24 83/5	disbanded 1 70/1
deposed [1] 19/16 deposited [4] 57/24 57/25 58/8 58/11	discuss 5 6/17 94/1 95/15 146/4 147/6 discussed [3] 4/22 11/11 11/16
deposition [26] 20/8 28/21 59/3 72/14 72/20	discussion [7] 13/6 20/11 70/3 91/23 141/24
72/21 73/12 74/16 74/17 74/21 75/11 75/12	142/1 142/21
75/16 77/2 77/13 78/10 78/24 79/2 79/11	discussions [3] 111/14 118/17 128/12
80/18 80/19 82/11 89/21 97/12 98/1 105/19	dishonest [3] 73/12 79/5 80/15
depravation 2 107/4 107/12 deprival 1 139/19	disliked [1] 106/8
deprivation [13] 119/8 120/6 120/7 125/1	dismiss [1] 5/3 dismissal [1] 69/18
136/18 137/9 140/10 140/13 140/19 140/22	dismissed [6] 4/20 68/19 69/6 86/3 106/19
141/4 143/8 143/10	121/23
deprived [5] 118/25 119/16 136/14 139/7	dispassionate [1] 126/22
140/7 describe 2 26/7 117/20	dispassionately 1 117/9
describe 2 20/7 11 //20 described 2 65/9 130/14	dispute [2] 32/16 123/8 disregard [3] 120/1 122/6 127/22
deserve [1] 118/12	disregarded [1] 14/15
deserves [1] 117/8	distributed [1] 131/5
desire [1] 124/6	distribution [1] 18/9
destroyed [1] 58/1	district [18] 1/1 1/1 1/11 3/3 3/3 14/14 53/16
detail 6 77/7 89/15 96/1 96/14 96/21 99/12 details 7 77/6 77/20 77/22 77/25 78/2	53/19 55/16 68/24 73/8 104/19 105/18 105/23 105/24 111/14 111/19 119/5
78/21 81/18	ditch [1] 86/18
detectives [1] 22/14	DNA [78] 18/22 21/20 22/9 22/10 22/12
determination [1] 71/20	27/12 27/14 27/16 27/25 28/2 30/18 31/25
determine [7] 71/17 101/25 104/13 118/9 125/24 126/2 129/18	40/7 44/11 46/25 47/12 47/17 47/17 47/18 47/19 47/20 52/5 52/6 52/24 53/11 53/17
determining [1] 121/23	54/4 54/15 54/18 54/19 54/19 54/22 55/1
deterrence [1] 17/19	55/3 55/5 55/9 55/18 55/22 56/13 56/15
Deykes [1] 13/1	56/18 56/19 56/23 56/25 57/15 57/24 57/25
did [119] 16/1 16/5 16/6 22/16 22/22 22/25	58/5 58/10 60/12 60/20 60/24 60/25 61/4
23/3 23/6 23/14 23/16 24/15 24/18 24/21 24/22 25/3 25/6 25/7 26/25 28/20 28/23 30/2	61/9 61/11 61/11 61/15 61/16 63/6 63/13 63/14 63/17 64/5 64/8 64/10 64/14 65/2 65/5
30/11 32/2 34/23 40/6 40/20 40/22 41/13	66/7 83/17 83/21 107/16 107/17 108/7
41/24 42/11 42/16 44/6 48/21 48/23 52/23	108/11 108/11 110/23
54/24 55/21 55/25 56/1 56/3 56/6 57/12	do [122] 5/23 8/19 8/20 10/8 10/25 14/4
58/24 59/2 59/16 60/10 62/17 62/19 62/20	14/25 15/2 16/21 17/24 19/2 20/16 21/22
63/5 64/13 66/5 66/6 71/4 71/18 71/19 71/24 71/24 71/25 72/2 72/4 72/10 72/14 73/6 73/6	
73/8 73/15 73/20 73/21 74/18 75/21 76/7	35/11 36/9 37/2 37/23 37/23 39/6 39/14
76/9 78/5 78/9 78/11 79/13 79/23 80/21	45/21 45/23 45/23 46/21 47/4 47/24 49/1
80/25 81/22 82/9 82/11 82/23 86/20 86/21	49/9 50/19 54/9 54/13 59/14 59/19 60/9
87/2 88/19 89/6 89/11 89/12 91/3 91/4 91/5 98/23 99/2 99/7 105/16 106/10 111/18	62/17 64/24 67/7 67/19 69/10 70/23 73/13 79/2 79/15 82/20 83/18 83/18 83/23 85/8
111/19 111/24 112/11 112/14 112/15 112/18	85/21 87/7 87/21 87/22 87/25 88/1 88/2
120/15 120/16 124/13 124/15 128/25 129/2	88/22 88/22 92/23 93/15 93/15 93/17 93/18
129/4 129/6 129/8 129/12 130/11 133/15	93/24 95/14 98/18 98/22 98/23 102/1 107/13
137/8 didn't [78 15/11 16/4 28/18 28/21 32/6	109/5 111/11 111/11 112/17 113/16 113/20
32/17 32/17 32/25 34/22 42/7 42/8 42/15	113/21 114/23 125/8 127/13 129/23 130/2 130/3 130/18 130/23 131/24 131/25 132/13
44/17 46/20 48/20 49/11 49/24 50/23 51/1	132/18 132/20 132/22 139/10 139/13 139/17
51/3 58/23 58/25 59/14 61/21 72/21 73/8	139/23 140/3 140/9 140/15 140/17 140/19
73/21 73/22 74/6 74/10 74/12 74/12 75/12 75/18 75/20 77/23 77/24 77/25 78/2 78/4	140/23 141/14 141/22 142/13 142/14 145/19
78/7 78/17 78/20 78/24 80/19 82/12 83/15	146/3 146/3 147/7 Docket [1] 3/7
83/20 83/23 85/16 86/22 87/11 87/25 88/1	doctor [1] 145/10
88/4 89/5 96/17 96/18 98/18 98/19 99/6 99/9	document [10] 35/9 35/20 35/23 36/19 38/8
105/11 105/24 106/20 106/21 107/19 108/4	45/21 73/25 98/25 99/4 99/6
108/8 108/12 108/13 108/16 108/18 110/13	documents [6] 78/13 78/15 78/16 114/8
different [11] 36/19 71/5 72/8 74/24 79/16	116/23 116/24 does [26] 24/6 24/12 25/18 37/21 37/25 38/7
84/3 99/24 101/23 107/23 112/1 128/5	52/3 54/2 56/16 56/16 57/20 73/25 75/7
difficult [3] 50/15 61/15 108/1	76/17 76/20 78/23 84/25 84/25 88/10 122/2
difficulty [1] 14/12	132/11 133/15 140/9 141/7 142/24 145/21
direct [17] 8/4 11/1 21/4 31/3 31/8 39/11	doesn't [29] 20/9 20/10 32/2 37/21 41/2
50/3 51/5 51/16 55/21 61/6 63/11 65/22 89/25 125/17 148/5 148/9	62/14 67/6 74/3 75/24 76/14 76/24 78/19
Direct/Redirect [2] 148/5 148/9	79/2 85/4 85/14 85/15 85/15 85/18 90/3 90/12 98/2 99/21 106/18 106/20 106/21
direction [2] 85/8 130/21	108/3 108/12 108/13 142/9
directly [1] 143/10	doing [13] 8/2 10/10 22/20 43/1 61/3 67/7
directs [1] 18/5	70/19 70/19 87/14 88/3 90/13 113/9 124/22

directs [1] 18/5

dollar [1] 143/5 don't [99] 4/3 6/1 6/5 12/7 14/25 15/16 16/20 17/4 17/7 18/7 19/17 20/6 30/10 31/12 31/23 31/25 32/19 33/1 33/8 33/16 37/15 38/1 38/1 38/23 40/20 41/15 41/16 42/23 43/1 43/20 44/1 44/24 45/14 45/15 45/17 47/16 47/16 47/20 48/6 48/16 48/19 48/22 49/23 50/6 50/18 57/19 62/5 62/6 62/22 64/7 64/9 65/4 65/6 67/8 70/22 75/14 77/16 77/21 78/6 79/11 82/1 82/1 83/7 83/8 90/5 90/6 92/5 92/15 92/16 94/1 100/17 107/22 110/9 110/20 113/22 114/4 114/12 114/23 116/11 117/6 125/25 128/6 128/12 128/17 128/18 129/16 133/13 134/18 137/15 137/21 141/12 142/10 142/10 143/10 143/17 144/4 147/6 147/7 147/7 done [19] 18/15 27/21 30/14 32/11 38/24 82/22 83/24 84/1 98/16 109/12 111/12 113/11 114/17 119/21 119/22 119/25 122/2 135/20 145/19 door [3] 4/3 4/4 7/20 doubt [6] 72/22 101/24 102/19 102/20 103/9 down [14] 38/24 46/15 57/4 71/3 84/20 88/21 89/8 90/11 90/18 99/25 100/3 101/5 109/1 147/2 downtown [1] 21/15 draft [4] 8/25 131/13 131/16 131/20 drafts [1] 131/12 dramatically [1] 80/11 draw [2] 117/4 117/10 drawing [1] 50/12 drawn [1] 59/7 driver [1] 76/10 driving [1] 89/8 drops [1] 13/10 due [3] 12/6 58/1 124/6 duly [2] 20/23 51/10 duped [2] 91/12 91/13 during |14| 8/3 16/19 16/24 17/17 22/6 26/12 44/6 69/9 72/3 73/11 82/7 89/21 96/18 117/3 dusting [1] 26/14 duties [1] 19/18 dynamics [1] 90/4

70/19 70/19 87/14 88/3 90/13 113/9 124/22

E-mail [1] 2/3 E-R-R-E-D [1] 135/25 E.G |1| 136/4 E1 [2] 134/12 134/13 each [14] 35/13 53/8 55/2 71/12 78/14 81/6 116/15 117/16 122/19 126/24 128/11 128/13 128/15 138/5 earlier [3] 26/22 85/5 117/23 early [3] 3/21 3/22 43/2 earnings [2] 7/2 126/18 earth [3] 84/20 85/5 111/7 easily [1] 13/8 EASTERN [3] 1/1 3/3 53/16 easy [3] 75/5 81/16 81/16 ECT [4] 37/7 37/11 39/5 42/12 education [1] 53/3 effect [3] 9/18 43/5 47/12 eight [2] 79/1 79/1 either [17] 15/7 15/10 25/22 42/8 59/8 66/5 71/7 73/7 107/11 108/18 116/24 123/23 124/24 128/2 139/19 140/11 146/5 ejector [6] 44/21 44/24 46/14 46/17 46/18 64/21 element [4] 116/15 116/16 120/4 125/10 elements [2] 118/1 118/13 else [13] 9/7 10/25 13/16 15/3 15/20 16/10

Case: 12-2479 Document: 40-1 Page: 37 09/27/2012 731928 126

Case: 12-2479 Docum	ent: 40-1 Page: 37 09/	27/2012 731928 126
	A1231	
E	40/6 40/7 40/8 40/10 41/11 41/14 42/13 43/0 44/2 56/2 56/7 65/5 65/7 67/3 67/18 68/7	6 explanation [6] 9/15 9/23 72/15 72/16 78/20 82/18
else [7] 17/10 58/9 73/13 86/6 104/7	68/17 69/11 70/7 70/8 70/20 70/24 71/16	explanations 1 9/16
113/18 128/10	75/6 75/15 76/22 82/6 83/2 84/6 84/8 85/25	explicated [1] 10/1
else's [1] 37/13	90/25 93/18 96/2 96/19 98/3 98/5 98/22	explore [1] 18/24
cmotion [1] 117/10 cmotional [9] 4/16 7/1 15/23 16/1 16/3 16/4	98/25 99/5 100/15 100/23 100/25 101/20 102/2 102/3 102/23 103/3 104/9 105/11	express 1 127/13 expressed 1 18/20
126/17 126/19 138/4	105/23 106/6 106/8 106/8 107/3 107/4 107/	. • • • • •
empirical [1] 18/18	107/12 107/14 107/22 108/11 109/4 111/15	extensively [2] 8/11 90/21
employed [1] 51/20	111/20 113/5 113/6 113/12 114/8 114/19	extent 2 10/16 126/9
employee [1] 52/8 employment [1] 22/16	115/3 115/9 115/22 116/2 117/8 117/13 117/21 120/20 120/23 120/24 121/21 121/2	extract [8] 27/16 41/10 63/21 64/2 67/6
encountered [2] 28/8 57/15	122/5 122/7 122/19 123/22 124/13 124/25	extraordinary [1] 127/13
end [10] 6/19 9/17 11/13 28/4 36/23 90/3	125/2 125/3 129/10 129/14 130/13 131/8	extreme [1] 58/2
93/17 101/15 114/4 145/20 ended [1] 123/9	131/10 131/14 131/18 131/22 133/7 133/20 135/13 135/16 144/13 146/10	eyc [2] 68/14 102/16 eyes [2] 76/5 76/7
enderse [1] 13/8	exact [1] 50/6	
ends [2] 37/12 88/5	exactly [5] 60/15 76/13 78/1 86/15 145/10	<u>F</u>
energy [1] 57/1	examination [18] 9/18 10/10 15/24 19/2	F.3d [4] 14/14 135/23 138/1 142/1
enforcement [1] 16/17 engage [2] 13/5 127/15	21/4 28/12 51/16 55/25 56/1 56/4 56/6 56/1 58/16 61/6 65/24 66/1 66/15 72/4	F1 1 134/3
engaged [1] 127/13	examinations [1] 8/4	fabrication [1] 85/16
enhancement [2] 74/11 74/23	examine [2] 4/1 4/16	face [2] 16/3 85/6
Enjoy [1] 94/5	examined [3] 20/23 51/10 118/7	facial [1] 117/17
enlarged 1 23/22 enlargement 1 24/19	examiner [6] 51/23 52/1 52/9 52/21 53/2 53/25	Facsimile [1] 2/2 fact [34] 11/20 18/25 31/8 39/8 54/7 59/6
enough [13] 25/22 56/18 61/11 61/18 61/19	examiner's [3] 18/21 19/1 108/6	59/14 61/13 63/21 71/11 71/12 75/7 77/8
61/23 63/19 78/17 83/12 108/10 108/11	examining [1] 56/8	77/10 89/5 89/6 90/2 96/8 98/20 99/2 99/7
108/11 111/9 entailed [1] 56/10	example [6] 52/15 81/8 89/20 97/7 124/4	99/20 109/24 110/7 110/10 110/15 110/18 110/25 111/4 112/4 113/1 113/14 121/22
entered [4] 70/4 114/1 139/2 145/16	127/14 excellent [2] 143/18 145/17	136/19
enters [1] 135/8	except [3] 116/15 122/13 128/7	factors [2] 57/22 58/1
entire [5] 54/19 68/15 77/22 83/5 83/13	excessive [1] 126/12	facts 11 9/19 15/9 15/15 32/20 79/10 91/24
entirely [3] 17/3 61/17 104/4 entitled [9] 19/5 20/1 20/10 91/8 115/5	exchanged [1] 58/10 exclusively [1] 126/1	96/3 114/14 122/6 122/7 123/14 fail 1 92/12
126/24 128/13 139/23 140/18	Excuse [4] 12/12 30/15 45/19 61/18	failed 1 41/19
entry [7] 78/17 78/23 78/25 98/2 98/4 98/6 98/9	excuses 1 84/7	failure [2] 121/25 125/15
98/9 environmental [1] 58/1	executing [1] 122/4 exercise 1 128/14	fair 11 5/4 90/24 107/1 116/1 116/6 124/19
equal [4] 114/25 115/4 115/5 115/12	exhibit [60] 23/20 35/9 35/23 36/16 45/17	false [29] 6/22 12/20 14/23 14/23 68/5 68/18
equally [1] 115/12	62/2 62/11 96/21 98/5 99/5 131/5 131/7	79/5 80/15 90/24 91/11 91/14 91/19 91/22
crred [1] 135/25 error 2] 18/19 139/4	131/8 131/10 131/13 131/14 131/18 131/22 133/6 133/7 133/19 133/20 133/22 133/23	92/7 93/14 101/9 107/3 107/12 115/20 116/2 116/16 122/18 124/21 124/25 125/3 129/10
especially [3] 13/23 14/5 41/10	133/23 133/23 133/24 133/24 133/25 133/2	
ESQ [5] 1/18 1/18 1/24 1/25 1/25	134/1 134/3 134/5 134/7 134/9 134/10	falsely [11] 12/4 90/23 101/18 103/25 116/4
essentially [3] 90/22 115/24 118/23	134/19 134/24 135/1 135/3 135/5 135/11 135/13 135/16 135/18 139/5 144/12 144/13	117/25 120/8 120/9 120/10 128/25 129/2 familiar 4 32/20 59/17 61/17 62/16
established [1] 115/11	146/10 148/13 148/14 148/15 148/16 148/1	
et [1] 140/12	148/18 148/19 148/20 148/21 148/22 148/2	
ethnic 1 114/22 evaluating 1 113/12	Exhibit 1 [1] 135/3	fast [1] 79/10 fatal [1] 21/19
evaluation [1] 87/21	Exhibit 11 [1] 99/5 Exhibit 20 [2] 62/2 62/11	favor [7] 102/5 109/7 116/7 123/4 123/10
even [18] 10/9 14/3 28/25 29/2 42/24 59/11	Exhibit 3 [3] 35/9 35/23 36/16	127/16 128/23
69/18 76/25 88/25 90/6 92/15 96/24 103/13 106/9 106/14 136/3 138/8 145/22	Exhibit 6 [1] 96/21 Exhibit 9 [3] 135/18 139/5 144/12	favorite [1] 78/22 FB1 1] 54/4
evening [1] 147/11	exhibits [13] 131/25 132/1 132/3 132/23	fear [1] 128/22
event [1] 144/5	133/9 133/15 133/16 133/19 134/2 134/14	feasible [5] 34/16 39/7 42/22 43/17 44/1
events [2] 115/22 117/19 ever [11] 28/7 49/4 54/15 55/8 57/14 73/3	134/15 135/12 148/12	federal [3] 52/18 55/15 115/5 feeding [2] 91/19 91/21
76/15 82/15 89/1 112/8 113/2	existed [10] 6/14 6/16 28/25 121/24 122/9 123/20 123/22 124/9 124/12 124/15	feel [5] 14/10 17/3 47/3 137/17 142/4
every [8] 22/1 26/14 26/15 49/4 82/22 96/1	existence [4] 9/12 9/22 121/19 122/7	feelings [1] 114/20
119/3 124/19 everybody [5] 37/13 114/25 115/4 138/22	exists [3] 9/18 13/20 123/14	feet [4] 76/8 76/12 80/7 82/3
139/14	exited [4] 94/2 131/3 141/23 146/8 expect [1] 58/4	FELICIA [1] 1/24 fell [1] 86/12
everyday [1] 22/15	experience [14] 16/24 17/2 18/20 19/5 25/2	fellow [1] 74/11
everyone [2] 20/14 70/14	26/1 26/2 26/10 26/13 27/7 47/11 50/3 57/1	
everything [2] 91/8 113/5 evidence [143] 6/16 6/21 6/22 10/22 12/21	60/22	109/13 109/16 118/10 125/5 142/14 142/16
14/22 15/1 16/9 18/17 21/12 21/14 21/16	expert [5] 18/17 18/24 55/8 55/18 118/10 experts [1] 118/11	field 3 53/14/55/8 55/18 figure 1 76/23
21/20 22/17 26/13 27/12 27/14 30/22 31/1	explain [7] 4/18 23/25 25/5 27/12 37/8 77/1	4 figured 1 88/5
31/9 31/15 31/17 33/17 33/19 33/21 33/23	77/16	file [5] 57/7 62/24 64/24 66/24 66/25
34/7 34/10 34/12 34/13 34/13 34/14 35/12 35/14 35/22 35/23 36/15 36/16 39/14 39/20	explained [2] 4/9 104/15 explains 1] 77/16	files [1] 52/6 fill [5] 35/12 77/16 77/21 78/13 98/19
37.22.22.23.33.10.37/14.37/20	Capitalio [1] / //10	1-1 002 , // 10 / // 10 / // //

09/27/2012 731928

A1232

filled [7] 35/14 35/16 38/23 39/4 78/18 80/16 98/14 fills [1] 77/4 final [2] 6/8 113/18 Finally [2] 15/21 28/7 find [46] 6/14 6/22 27/4 32/12 42/11 42/15 51/1 51/3 58/4 61/9 102/6 106/10 106/23 107/9 109/7 110/7 116/7 117/25 118/1 118/2 118/18 123/20 124/9 124/14 124/16 125/4 125/23 127/5 127/7 127/12 127/16 129/17 129/20 136/13 137/21 138/24 139/16 139/18 139/20 140/7 140/7 140/10 140/14 140/15 140/17 140/18 finding [2] 136/12 136/23 findings [3] 56/14 57/4 118/16 finds [2] 127/17 136/11 fine [6] 42/17 51/19 92/18 132/7 133/4 fingerprint [23] 21/25 22/11 25/6 25/7 26/21 27/10 48/24 49/1 49/4 49/5 49/9 49/12 [frisk [1] 80/16 50/16 82/19 82/24 98/12 98/16 98/23 107/18 107/24 108/2 108/2 112/11 fingerprints [18] 21/21 25/14 25/19 26/3 26/6 26/11 26/20 31/23 49/24 50/4 50/9 51/2 51/3 82/16 103/15 103/18 107/16 108/3 finish [3] 6/17 30/16 34/11 fire |1| 70/21 firearm [29] 22/24 23/1 23/7 23/8 24/2 25/11 26/21 33/9 37/7 39/1 40/8 41/2 41/16 42/10 46/1 46/12 46/13 51/1 55/23 72/20 72/22 75/22 96/24 99/11 121/5 121/6 121/9 122/13 122/14 firearms [6] 18/22 26/2 26/12 60/12 60/20 61/9 fires [1] 46/16 first [54] 4/11 5/21 5/24 7/22 8/24 9/1 11/12 14/11 20/23 51/9 58/20 66/22 74/25 80/9 game [1] 80/9 82/15 83/4 83/19 85/6 86/17 88/22 89/14 91/2 91/21 92/6 92/6 92/11 95/18 95/22 98/15 100/2 100/14 101/9 101/17 104/12 107/20 110/6 111/1 111/2 111/4 112/12 112/12 115/17 116/3 119/13 120/7 120/23 123/1 126/3 128/25 129/19 139/7 139/8 140/14 144/2 first-year [1] 14/11 fit [1] 143/10 FITCH [1] 1/14 five [7] 4/24 19/12 33/5 52/17 68/24 105/7 floor [2] 41/25 42/8 flowing [2] 89/23 139/18 focused [3] 7/21 8/10 138/16 folks [12] 70/13 71/23 72/16 73/15 75/23 79/3 79/13 86/19 86/23 109/12 109/18 111/11 follow [5] 54/5 114/5 117/11 118/18 143/25 follow-up [1] 143/25 following [6] 14/12 17/25 54/3 54/7 103/11 129/16 follows [2] 10/21 20/24 fooled [1] 92/19 foolish [1] 77/15 foot [1] 25/8 footnote [8] 11/20 11/22 11/24 11/25 12/2 12/7 13/10 13/10 force [1] 79/1 forensic [12] 41/10 41/14 51/24 53/1 53/5 53/23 82/5 83/2 84/5 85/25 107/14 107/22 foreperson [1] 117/2 form [7] 39/4 39/18 77/5 77/5 80/15 80/16 80/16

formal [1] 53/3 formed [1] 135/25 forth [1] 54/4 forward [3] 56/18 81/10 81/10 found [12] 18/25 26/23 49/20 60/12 63/6 96/23 136/19 138/14 138/18 140/3 141/4 four [32] 22/13 24/25 29/3 30/2 52/2 52/3 59/11 63/24 83/13 86/21 87/4 87/24 88/15 88/25 89/13 90/2 93/21 95/25 95/25 99/15 109/17 109/21 111/10 112/13 112/21 112/21 112/23 113/1 119/12 123/5 126/16 140/11 four-day [1] 22/13 fourth [4] 4/19 119/19 120/10 120/16 Fox [5] 28/9 68/12 88/22 102/16 103/8 framing [1] 71/15 FRANCES [1] 1/25 frankly [1] 29/2 free [1] 132/13 freedom [2] 138/9 138/12 frequently [2] 27/15 47/23 front [13] 60/9 66/17 72/11 76/11 76/11 79/20 79/24 80/3 80/5 80/12 89/3 93/7 112/2 frustrated [1] 13/9 full [4] 9/11 9/11 15/18 122/3 fume [2] 25/15 26/12 fumed |2| 30/19 103/19 fumes [2] 25/12 25/12 furning [5] 25/7 26/14 30/12 30/18 30/20 function |3| 24/17 71/17 126/2 funny [2] 74/15 75/11 further [13] 3/25 7/12 28/11 58/13 60/24 60/25 65/20 67/10 67/13 71/10 87/21 105/10 121/25 furtive [3] 8/6 80/17 80/22 G

Gather [1] 132/1 gathered [1] 132/23 gave [14] 23/8 31/21 48/10 48/12 48/15 48/17 69/1 72/7 91/11 95/21 95/22 97/10 105/9 131/6 gender [1] 114/22 general [2] 16/4 72/17 generally [1] 31/4 generated [1] 78/16 genetic [1] 53/12 gentlemen [12] 70/6 72/4 81/3 86/4 90/17 95/6 103/21 107/10 108/20 112/21 113/7 113/16 GERALD [1] 1/18 get [37] 3/13 3/16 5/23 21/20 22/25 31/9 31/14 32/6 34/19 43/13 47/20 49/15 50/4 50/9 50/16 61/15 64/8 64/14 82/24 83/3 83/20 86/18 89/5 90/20 93/7 93/20 93/24 100/8 104/3 107/22 108/1 109/2 110/9 110/14 110/17 133/15 145/8 gets [1] 107/24 getting [2] 3/21 27/9 give [25] 14/10 22/2 55/20 95/13 104/8 104/20 105/2 108/23 109/14 113/20 114/5 117/8 118/11 126/9 128/8 135/18 139/5 139/9 140/1 140/2 140/8 141/1 141/3 141/5 143/9 given [15] 9/3 14/10 14/24 27/8 37/6 37/7 48/4 53/14 53/15 53/18 68/5 69/25 142/25 gives [4] 72/8 77/4 92/24 113/13 giving [8] 6/17 15/13 70/15 135/18 139/5 140/1 141/1 141/6 gloves [4] 25/4 31/20 42/7 48/15

glue [2] 25/12 25/12 go [30] 8/15 15/13 15/18 22/1 22/25 23/3 23/6 27/15 38/25 39/6 42/24 43/6 56/18 61/22 79/7 79/14 81/10 90/12 90/21 95/14 114/4 116/11 131/1 132/2 132/2 141/4 141/9 141/21 145/11 146/5 goal [1] 124/3 goes [3] 15/15 97/25 104/18 going [60] 5/7 5/8 8/1 10/21 11/5 11/13 14/4 14/25 15/2 16/8 17/9 18/8 19/3 35/8 36/25 42/23 52/25 54/5 59/18 70/7 71/10 71/22 72/12 75/5 76/17 77/15 77/15 78/1 79/4 81/10 81/12 83/1 83/22 85/1 87/19 88/8 88/17 88/21 88/23 90/9 90/18 90/19 90/20 93/16 93/20 96/19 99/21 101/14 101/16 104/20 105/13 107/2 108/25 110/6 112/3 114/4 125/24 136/5 141/3 142/11 gone [3] 3/19 112/22 112/24 good [22] 20/14 20/15 21/6 21/7 28/14 28/15 28/17 51/18 51/19 58/18 58/19 70/13 72/12 82/25 84/21 88/24 89/7 95/6 95/7 99/19 110/18 147/11 got [25] 32/8 33/12 37/15 49/5 76/10 76/11 78/18 86/2 86/18 86/20 87/3 87/20 88/5 88/7 90/10 90/13 92/2 98/9 98/22 100/23 102/3 103/16 103/17 137/14 140/14 government [1] 124/21 government's [1] 124/21 grains [1] 26/9 grainy [1] 26/5 grand [52] 4/24 6/13 11/17 11/19 11/21 12/15 12/16 12/20 13/4 13/12 13/18 13/25 14/3 14/15 14/21 28/18 52/17 55/14 58/23 68/25 69/1 69/3 69/5 73/6 74/8 75/21 76/1 79/17 79/20 79/21 80/1 80/13 89/3 91/13 92/20 93/8 93/11 105/3 105/5 105/8 105/9 105/19 106/13 106/14 106/18 111/22 111/23 122/23 122/25 123/19 125/6 129/11 grant |1| 13/12 great [4] 19/5 61/14 88/6 89/15 greater [1] 115/5 grips [4] 27/19 46/7 46/11 64/20 gross [2] 1/24 127/22 ground [7] 71/7 71/9 96/7 96/9 99/11 102/18 121/11 grounds [4] 35/25 69/18 92/9 113/15 Group [1] 52/24 guard [2] 27/18 44/1 guess [5] 12/16 37/14 90/15 100/23 108/17 guided [1] 126/21 guidelines [3] 54/3 54/5 54/8 guilty [6] 90/13 101/25 101/25 106/18 122/11 122/14 gun [162] guns [3] 47/9 47/16 49/1 guy [8] 80/2 87/20 88/10 88/23 88/25 89/3 90/6 110/9

guys [1] 110/15 H

had |54| 4/11 7/25 15/11 16/15 16/16 22/11 22/13 26/18 30/5 36/17 42/2 48/4 49/21 57/14 62/24 62/24 63/19 67/1 68/15 69/18 70/3 72/15 77/3 79/21 80/2 82/21 83/14 87/6 88/7 89/22 91/7 92/9 97/15 99/3 101/14 102/8 102/16 102/17 105/9 106/7 108/15 110/13 111/3 111/10 112/18 113/9 116/17 117/5 117/18 121/15 121/16 125/25 143/25 hadn't [1] 78/1 half |11| 22/10 33/13 52/22 52/25 53/1 86/21 87/24 93/22 113/1 126/16 140/11 hallway [1] 30/7

09/27/2012 731928

A1233

Н hammer [2] 27/20 44/24 hand [5] 38/11 41/25 81/22 81/23 81/23 handcuffed [1] 87/6 handcuffing [1] 120/12 handle [15] 10/6 21/22 24/6 24/7 26/9 27/19 44/15 46/8 46/8 47/12 54/9 107/19 108/1 108/4 108/12 handled [2] 47/22 49/21 hands [3] 68/15 90/7 102/17 handwriting [1] 99/10 handwritten [1] 134/22 handy [1] 137/15 happen [8] 32/3 34/2 44/7 57/21 75/25 87/11 100/18 105/11 happened [32] 20/8 32/12 33/6 79/21 80/6 81/15 85/11 85/19 86/14 86/15 86/15 87/3 87/18 90/8 91/15 92/21 95/25 96/17 97/1 99/15 109/16 110/12 110/12 110/14 112/21 112/23 113/7 113/7 113/10 115/19 117/11 117/12 happening [2] 57/23 81/17 happens [5] 34/4 42/19 42/20 43/2 89/19 happy [1] 89/24 hard [2] 140/6 140/17 harped [1] 99/1 harping [1] 96/13 has [58] 4/2 4/5 9/2 9/21 10/16 12/17 14/19 15/22 18/17 18/18 18/19 24/11 26/9 27/19 29/3 36/5 36/19 37/12 49/15 57/17 57/19 57/25 58/8 71/13 72/16 77/2 77/14 88/8 96/2 99/1 106/4 107/10 108/22 111/23 115/7 115/8 115/13 115/13 116/14 117/25 120/7 122/8 124/19 124/24 125/19 125/23 129/18 136/20 137/10 137/17 137/18 137/23 138/19 139/9 143/4 143/10 143/14 143/22 hasn't [2] 65/18 105/10 have [224] haven't [5] 19/16 30/3 63/24 63/25 64/1 having [8] 10/9 16/3 16/24 20/23 41/15 51/9 91/15 128/11 he [342] he'll [2] 109/2 109/3 he's [44] 3/14 3/15 4/3 4/17 20/1 20/10 37/11 74/19 75/25 76/5 76/10 76/10 76/11 76/11 76/17 77/2 77/3 79/2 80/3 80/13 81/10 81/10 81/12 85/1 86/17 86/18 89/10 89/11 89/13 90/9 90/9 90/13 90/13 91/8 95/20 96/9 98/9 100/3 100/15 100/23 106/18 106/25 112/5 126/3 head [1] 47/7 healthy [1] 91/23 hear [10] 20/17 67/19 70/5 92/8 109/1 111/1 home [2] 88/8 146/6 111/5 117/18 118/6 142/23 heard [44] 7/14 9/4 67/18 70/20 71/21 71/23 HON [1] 1/10 79/15 82/5 83/2 86/16 87/4 87/19 91/8 92/25 96/4 96/6 97/3 98/14 98/21 101/22 102/8 102/10 102/15 102/20 103/6 103/8 103/8 103/12 103/22 105/6 105/22 106/12 106/14 107/15 107/21 108/5 108/17 110/23 112/4 112/7 112/8 112/10 114/20 114/24 hearing [4] 18/13 19/4 20/16 89/25 heat [2] 25/11 58/2 held [10] 11/14 12/19 25/13 69/3 105/2 105/3 112/23 112/24 122/22 142/21 help [7] 70/7 78/14 81/24 88/18 114/15 128/10 132/22 helpful [3] 3/21 5/19 17/8 her [4] 19/9 55/20 73/21 73/22 here [67] 3/14 3/15 11/23 36/1 39/8 46/13 46/14 46/16 46/19 52/8 59/4 67/3 70/14 71/10 71/11 71/17 72/12 74/20 76/19 76/21 hook [1] 86/20

78/23 79/12 83/20 84/18 86/14 87/14 88/15 hope [1] 109/7 88/15 88/19 89/4 89/19 90/11 92/21 93/24 97/3 98/10 100/24 102/1 105/20 107/25 108/21 109/16 110/12 110/14 113/7 113/20 114/20 114/25 115/4 117/11 118/10 119/5 119/7 119/18 120/12 120/14 120/16 120/17 120/20 122/13 123/23 125/7 134/6 142/12 144/16 145/11 147/4 here's [5] 14/13 80/21 83/3 83/6 111/14 hesitate [1] 128/12 Hey [1] 78/6 hide [1] 76/18 hiding [1] 98/20 high [8] 25/8 56/22 61/3 63/17 63/20 65/8 65/8 67/7 higher [2] 83/24 111/10 higher-sensitivity [1] 83/24 highest [1] 75/4 him [74] 20/10 37/18 40/17 40/19 40/21 68/16 69/6 71/4 71/8 72/21 73/15 73/17 73/25 74/10 75/10 75/17 75/22 75/24 75/25 76/11 76/11 76/12 77/22 78/3 78/19 79/8 80/5 80/23 82/22 84/22 87/23 89/1 89/2 89/3 89/5 89/11 89/20 90/15 91/3 91/4 91/9 97/5 97/6 97/8 100/5 100/6 102/22 102/23 102/24 1'd [6] 22/21 26/16 44/25 55/17 62/1 141/9 103/13 103/13 104/14 104/16 106/8 106/9 106/11 106/15 106/15 106/18 106/21 106/22 108/12 108/13 108/23 111/17 112/5 120/9 121/8 121/9 121/17 123/2 126/5 140/8 141/3 himself [2] 82/10 100/8 his [113] 4/2 4/16 11/17 11/17 13/7 37/10 37/19 41/25 47/7 56/8 58/4 68/10 68/14 68/15 68/25 69/5 72/1 72/5 72/14 73/3 73/10 73/12 73/22 74/2 74/13 74/21 75/10 75/13 75/17 75/19 75/21 75/22 76/5 76/24 77/1 77/4 77/13 78/24 79/24 80/14 80/15 80/16 81/22 81/22 81/23 81/25 82/11 82/21 86/9 86/9 86/10 86/18 86/20 89/13 89/16 89/21 89/24 89/25 90/7 95/17 95/19 95/23 96/5 96/10 96/12 96/12 96/15 96/25 97/6 97/11 97/23 97/25 98/1 98/10 98/17 98/18 99/23 100/10 100/25 102/11 102/14 102/16 102/17 102/25 103/3 103/17 104/16 105/4 105/8 105/9 105/19 105/21 106/14 107/5 107/12 108/10 108/19 108/23 109/2 110/18 113/8 113/8 115/13 116/16 122/24 122/24 123/3 124/3 125/23 139/20 139/21 140/7 140/10 history [1] 4/2 hit [2] 102/18 109/14 hitting [1] 96/9 hold [7] 26/10 39/15 75/25 79/8 88/2 93/20 113/17 holding [2] 26/10 92/17 homicides [2] 52/16 57/2 honest [3] 87/17 87/22 113/10 honor [85] 3/12 3/16 7/14 7/21 9/2 9/5 9/8 10/8 10/20 11/1 11/12 12/2 12/6 12/10 13/17 impede [1] 19/17 13/22 14/4 14/19 14/22 15/4 15/5 15/22 15/22 16/22 17/16 17/22 18/10 18/13 19/7 19/15 19/21 20/7 20/15 23/17 23/19 31/11 35/24 36/4 36/11 36/14 42/1 45/8 45/12 45/14 47/2 48/8 49/17 50/1 51/6 55/17 57/7 65/23 67/14 67/16 67/17 68/3 69/11 69/21 69/22 70/12 93/19 129/24 129/25 130/1 130/6 132/9 132/10 133/1 133/13 134/2 134/11 136/10 137/6 137/13 137/20 138/1 138/16 141/8 141/18 142/8 142/22 142/24 143/25 144/16 145/14 Honor's [5] 7/16 7/24 36/2 69/2 69/17 Honorable [4] 3/4 3/5 95/2 147/1

hopefully [1] 25/14 hostility [2] 106/5 124/5 hour [1] 33/13 hours [5] 33/6 43/4 43/4 78/18 89/10 house [3] 100/20 110/19 120/13 how [62] 21/22 21/24 22/6 22/19 22/22 24/4 24/8 24/15 24/16 25/2 26/7 26/12 26/18 28/16 31/9 31/14 37/15 41/21 42/6 46/25 50/18 51/18 52/11 52/20 54/5 54/9 54/13 55/1 55/5 55/11 70/17 71/24 72/3 72/8 72/10 72/14 73/13 74/19 75/7 76/12 77/15 78/1 80/10 80/14 89/23 90/1 98/1 98/13 99/25 100/24 100/24 102/7 104/20 114/16 115/1 128/17 129/21 138/13 139/25 140/6 140/17 144/6 however |6| 10/16 96/2 97/11 107/6 121/20 135/20 human [1] 112/17 hundred [1] 26/16 hundreds [3] 26/16 30/14 54/12 hypothesis [1] 141/3 141 [26] 3/23 4/17 4/18 5/1 6/12 9/25 17/14 17/15 25/25 43/16 49/18 65/15 66/9 77/24 81/14 86/15 88/13 94/5 115/7 116/21 118/16 128/8 134/20 138/23 142/23 146/5 1'm [49] 3/24 5/6 9/6 9/11 12/15 14/10 14/25 15/1 16/8 17/5 17/8 17/11 17/12 18/8 19/3 19/15 21/12 23/19 35/8 36/25 37/15 39/15 40/20 40/21 42/22 47/14 52/4 53/22 60/14 61/21 62/1 65/10 71/10 71/15 75/14 76/19 85/13 85/21 90/19 99/21 114/4 129/10 133/4 136/5 137/5 137/25 139/16 140/8 145/10 l've [22] 3/19 4/21 9/25 10/2 12/14 14/10 18/15 52/22 53/8 53/8 54/25 55/2 84/2 84/2 84/4 84/5 85/13 114/17 125/4 138/3 144/4 idea [4] 47/6 77/2 77/3 110/22 |identification [8] 25/20 28/3 45/9 45/20 62/2 62/8 62/9 62/12 identifies [1] 7/21 ignore [2] 118/3 122/5 П [1] 1/9 ill [4] 106/5 106/7 124/4 127/25 illegal [2] 115/18 121/5 **Winois** [1] 53/6 illogical [1] 85/19 illustration [1] 80/14 imagine [1] 58/7 immediately [2] 19/20 118/7 immune [2] 12/25 13/25 immunity [7] 12/17 13/8 13/13 69/13 69/19 119/9 119/17 impeach [3] 72/4 97/6 97/7 impeachment [1] 10/11 import [1] 4/24 important [20] 15/1 41/3 41/6 41/8 41/17 41/22 43/13 70/18 77/8 77/9 77/10 77/11 77/21 96/3 99/7 99/12 109/24 110/24 111/15 145/9 importantly [2] 81/18 85/9 impose [1] 127/6 impossible [1] 68/16 improperly [3] 4/5 7/19 7/20 impugn [1] 5/9 impugning [1] 8/5 inaecurate [1] 107/8 inadequate [1] 126/12

incarcerated [1] 139/22

Case: 12-2479 Document: 40-1 Page: 40 09/27/2012 731928 126

A1234

inches [2] 24/9 46/23 incident [3] 88/16 98/5 112/21 inclined [1] 10/13 include [11 97/15 included [2] 35/19 40/14 includes [2] 7/23 53/12 including [1] 8/6 inconsistencies [3] 95/23 99/14 109/19 inconsistency [1] 142/12 inconsistent [1] 97/12 incorrect [1] 107/20 indeed [1] 118/6 independent [2] 30/10 138/5 INDEX [1] 148/2 indicate [3] 36/22 114/18 118/16 indicates |2| 5/16 135/21 indicating [2] 128/21 135/25 indict [2] 106/15 111/25 indicted [5] 106/15 106/18 111/23 111/25 122/20 indictment |6| 4/24 6/13 13/19 14/15 14/21 123/19 indifference [2] 110/13 127/23 indifferent [1] 110/20 individual [5] 5/25 44/7 126/25 128/14 128/14 individually [1] 116/24 individuals [2] 107/15 118/25 infects [1] 8/8 infer [4] 110/8 110/20 124/8 125/25 inference [1] 69/7 inferences [2] 117/4 117/10 inform [2] 101/16 128/19 information [19] 18/25 35/19 37/6 37/15 37/16 37/18 41/3 41/6 41/18 63/5 68/13 91/11 91/20 91/21 96/17 98/10 107/7 121/17 124/20 initial [11] 4/6 5/9 7/20 7/23 7/24 8/5 10/22 47/24 48/5 48/7 120/19 initially [2] 8/7 8/14 initiate [2] 123/25 124/10 initiated [1] 123/2 initiates [2] 124/1 124/2 initiation [4] 12/22 123/6 123/11 123/12 injured [1] 119/10 injuries [9] 4/17 7/1 16/3 125/12 126/13 126/17 126/19 127/8 138/5 injury [15] 15/23 16/1 16/4 125/14 125/17 125/17 125/20 125/21 126/5 126/10 126/10 126/14 126/15 127/6 127/7 innocent [3] 88/1 88/10 119/23 innovations [1] 61/14 inquire [1] 31/13 inquiry [1] 121/25 inside [6] 25/9 48/17 49/15 80/7 80/7 83/8 insignificant [1] 28/2 instead [3] 12/25 83/18 87/22 instigation [1] 115/24 instruct [4] 17/9 101/12 110/6 136/5 instructed [2] 47/8 82/21 instructing [1] 126/1 instruction [17] 4/8 4/23 4/25 5/17 5/18 8/9 9/2 10/9 14/11 18/4 118/19 135/24 142/10 142/25 144/8 144/21 145/2 instructions [12] 5/2 104/20 104/22 104/24 105/1 109/15 113/13 114/3 114/5 114/6 131/4 144/6 insufficient [13] 18/22 56/15 56/17 57/15 57/20 60/20 60/23 63/11 63/13 63/14 67/4 108/8 111/4 intellect [1] 82/18

intended [2] 13/7 120/11 intent [1] 107/8 intentional [1] 119/21 intentionally [1] 119/14 interpreting [1] 54/20 interrogate [1] 87/9 interrogatories [1] 69/25 interrupt [3] 17/7 30/15 61/21 interrupted [1] 17/5 interruption [1] 99/17 interviewed [1] 89/2 introduced [1] 114/8 investigation [2] 13/5 122/4 involved [2] 22/23 28/8 involvement [4] 22/21 28/4 35/3 105/10 involves [1] 57/1 involving [1] 13/3 is [427] isn't [27] 9/23 17/19 24/13 39/8 43/13 49/16 49/21 50/21 50/23 59/7 59/25 61/9 61/16 63/12 63/18 64/5 64/14 64/16 66/19 71/6 75/5 77/12 79/9 80/9 99/3 107/20 107/20 issue [19] 4/5 7/25 8/2 8/12 8/22 8/25 68/20 69/20 71/3 71/15 109/23 110/2 115/10 116/3 116/4 120/17 133/13 133/14 143/23 issues [5] 11/4 16/13 86/13 115/9 116/7 it [337] it's [119] 3/24 4/22 4/24 5/13 6/4 8/25 10/21 11/18 14/3 15/19 17/3 17/8 18/23 20/6 26/5 27/5 27/19 34/15 34/16 36/10 36/15 38/6 38/22 38/24 42/21 42/21 43/13 43/13 43/17 45/20 47/18 47/22 48/7 50/15 50/20 56/25 57/1 57/20 58/6 58/6 58/7 58/10 59/23 60/19 60/19 62/11 64/15 69/7 70/21 72/12 72/20 73/11 74/17 75/2 77/10 77/11 77/15 78/12 78/17 79/5 79/9 81/3 82/24 83/13 85/16 85/19 86/15 87/13 87/20 88/1 88/11 90/2 90/15 91/16 91/24 92/18 93/7 93/9 93/13 96/25 99/4 99/5 99/5 103/4 105/4 105/25 108/19 109/21 110/14 110/15 110/20 111/8 111/9 111/9 111/20 117/6 119/5 119/18 119/21 119/22 122/17 125/7 126/1 127/1 132/13 133/4 134/4 134/19 134/25 137/1 137/4 138/2 140/6 140/17 142/1 142/1 142/4 143/18 143/19 item [10] 25/10 25/13 25/13 25/14 47/19 57/24 57/25 58/5 58/7 58/8 items [10] 56/7 56/8 56/8 58/10 61/15 64/16 64/17 64/19 65/18 88/13 its [1] 120/1

itself [2] 136/22 138/10

113/13

J-O-S-E-P-H [1] 21/3 JACK [5] 1/10 3/4 3/5 95/2 147/1 jail [9] 86/21 87/23 93/21 113/2 113/11 126/16 126/20 126/20 136/20 JBW [1] 1/4 job [9] 22/1 22/15 35/13 70/17 70/19 75/3 91/9 98/18 103/4 jobs [1] 43/1 Joe [1] 56/5 JOHANA [1] 1/25 John's [1] 53/20 Johnson [2] 2/1 2/3 join [1] 132/19 JON [1] 1/18 Joseph [3] 20/20 20/23 21/2 JOSHUA [11] 1/2 3/7 32/23 44/8 44/8 49/20] 51/2 71/4 80/22 96/23 98/7 judge [12] 1/11 87/15 92/8 101/12 104/20 105/1 106/17 107/1 109/14 110/6 110/21

judges [1] 114/14 judgment [2] 87/14 128/15 Judi [2] 2/1 2/3 Judy [1] 73/20 Julio |1| 37/10 June [1] 57/9 June 10 [1] 57/9 juries [1] 55/14 jurisdiction [1] 119/8 jurisprudence [2] 143/21 143/22 juror [2] 92/25 99/17 jurors [7] 71/17 82/17 91/9 110/7 112/7 130/19 141/10 jury [117] 5/21 8/11 11/17 11/19 11/21 12/15 12/16 12/20 13/4 13/12 13/18 13/25 14/3 14/5 14/10 14/21 16/8 17/13 18/5 18/9 21/8 23/25 25/5 27/12 28/18 38/18 46/6 52/17 58/23 67/22 68/25 69/1 69/3 69/5 69/22 69/25 70/2 70/4 72/11 73/6 74/8 75/21 76/1 79/12 79/17 79/20 79/21 80/1 80/13 86/11 87/15 89/3 91/14 92/20 93/8 93/11 93/19 94/2 94/3 94/4 95/3 105/3 105/5 105/8 105/9 105/19 106/14 106/14 106/18 111/22 111/23 113/24 114/1 115/16 116/13 122/23 122/25 125/6 125/9 127/4 128/7 129/11 131/3 131/6 132/11 133/17 135/10 135/17 136/5 136/8 137/20 138/15 138/17 138/24 139/1 139/2 139/11 139/15 139/24 140/5 140/21 140/24 141/16 141/23 142/3 142/9 142/18 143/24 144/11 144/20 145/6 145/16 145/17 146/1 146/8 147/3 147/9 jury's [4] 4/24 6/13 14/15 123/19 just [117] 3/12 5/25 6/1 6/8 6/19 7/11 8/18 9/2 9/6 9/8 10/4 11/3 11/18 12/10 12/12 13/18 14/18 15/14 16/4 16/12 16/17 16/23 17/5 17/12 19/15 22/1 22/14 26/5 27/14 30/21 31/3 31/8 34/11 38/24 41/17 41/24 45/20 46/2 47/16 47/17 48/23 59/23 63/2 65/9 65/23 66/19 67/3 70/13 70/15 70/18 72/9 72/17 72/22 75/23 76/7 77/17 78/19 79/7 79/10 79/12 81/4 81/5 83/15 84/10 84/11 84/23 84/24 85/3 85/17 86/12 86/18 87/1 87/2 87/8 87/12 87/14 87/17 87/17 88/16 88/21 88/24 89/15 90/7 90/14 90/19 91/18 92/3 93/6 97/23 98/4 106/17 106/19 108/2 109/13 109/18 110/5 110/9 110/24 111/8 113/5 113/9 113/23 131/5 132/15 135/20 136/7 136/22 137/16 138/1 138/11 142/3 142/5 142/13 143/1 143/21 145/4 145/19 justice [3] 102/3 113/21 124/4 justified [1] 88/5

justify [1] 127/20 L/

K K-E-R-M-A-N |2| 136/24 141/25 keep [5] 38/8 108/21 130/19 146/6 147/8 keeps [2] 86/8 86/10 kept |3| 24/23 24/24 68/14 Kerman [8] 136/11 136/23 137/10 138/1 141/25 143/7 143/7 144/24 key [1] 109/23 kicker [1] 83/10 kind [3] 27/14 76/16 77/17 King [1] 136/4 knew [5] 85/2 88/3 88/20 88/20 106/9 know [67] 9/16 11/12 17/2 22/15 24/16 26/9 26/15 26/16 27/25 33/8 33/8 33/16 37/15 37/23 38/2 41/16 42/23 43/4 43/5 43/17 43/20 43/22 44/24 46/16 47/5 47/14 50/18 57/19 62/14 62/17 62/19 64/25 66/17 66/21 73/13 77/17 78/7 78/24 79/2 79/12 79/13 85/10 86/11 86/19 86/19 88/4 88/5 88/17

Case: 12-2479 Document: 40-1 Page: 41 09/27/2012 731928 126

A1235

main [1] 90/22 letters [1] 77/20 K level |3| 52/2 52/3 75/4 maintained [1] 99/16 know... [19] 88/19 89/14 90/5 91/23 92/5 liability [21] 126/2 126/4 126/7 126/25 maintains [2] 61/13 63/21 93/14 98/2 100/13 100/17 103/16 104/6 137/17 137/19 137/21 137/23 139/8 139/10 maintenance [1] 12/22 111/22 112/8 117/19 132/16 134/18 137/16 139/13 139/16 139/18 139/18 140/3 140/7 majority [1] 13/3 142/10 144/4 140/10 140/15 140/15 140/17 141/4 make [56] 4/18 5/21 11/3 16/17 16/18 16/18 knowingly [6] 107/3 119/21 124/25 129/9 liable [10] 11/5 11/14 69/3 105/2 105/3 17/6 19/16 25/19 28/3 31/19 32/2 32/12 129/13 130/13 106/23 116/11 119/10 122/22 122/23 34/10 34/12 54/7 71/20 73/15 73/20 74/11 knowledge [4] 64/3 65/19 66/10 123/15 liberty [15] 80/10 87/15 87/23 107/5 107/12 76/14 76/17 76/20 76/24 80/2 80/10 81/1 known [5] 9/19 23/10 120/1 124/21 126/7 125/2 136/18 136/21 137/9 138/4 138/14 81/7 81/8 81/19 84/25 85/4 85/14 85/15 knows [9] 83/1 88/8 90/14 96/4 96/4 96/4 139/19 140/8 140/11 143/9 85/15 85/18 85/21 88/24 90/8 90/12 90/14 96/6 96/8 98/9 lie [7] 74/8 74/8 75/22 76/1 80/25 93/8 96/5 97/12 97/20 99/21 111/18 112/9 113/3 108/22 113/19 121/25 126/8 127/19 131/25 132/5 lied [3] 71/13 75/23 118/3 132/11 144/19 L-A-M-O-U-S-E-S-M-I-T-H [1] 51/15 makes [10] 78/19 99/22 99/22 99/24 99/25 life [2] 107/21 107/21 lab [3] 22/14 27/24 108/17 light [5] 5/4 13/23 14/13 92/21 117/21 100/9 100/11 100/25 115/18 124/18 making [6] 3/24 17/5 18/16 68/10 122/1 Laboratories [1] 52/25 lights [3] 97/16 97/17 97/19 laboratory [9] 52/4 53/8 53/10 53/17 53/25 like [32] 7/15 16/12 18/23 22/21 25/8 25/8 54/6 56/22 59/19 60/23 25/8 32/16 50/15 55/17 57/2 62/1 70/23 76/7 malice [11] 106/3 106/9 110/7 110/8 110/11 lack [5] 84/6 85/24 110/8 110/21 122/2 78/17 79/11 80/2 81/1 81/23 82/20 84/25 110/20 123/7 123/13 124/7 124/9 124/16 lacked [2] 110/10 124/9 90/12 91/24 92/19 92/20 95/12 107/17 malicious [11] 5/3 11/9 68/22 69/6 104/12 ladies [12] 70/6 72/4 81/3 86/3 90/17 95/6 114/22 132/12 132/16 144/7 144/11 104/17 105/13 106/2 106/24 122/16 138/8 103/21 107/10 108/20 112/20 113/6 113/16 maticiously [11] 90/23 91/18 104/14 106/10 likely [1] 126/13 LAMOUSE [7] 51/9 51/14 51/18 55/18 58/3 likewise [1] 106/19 115/23 116/5 123/1 124/2 127/18 129/4 58/18 148/8 limine [2] 36/2 137/6 129/6 LAMOUSE-SMITH [4] 51/9 51/14 55/18 limited [2] 4/10 122/13 man [24] 71/7 71/18 76/9 78/18 78/24 79/4 limiting [2] 5/17 5/18 79/16 80/2 83/22 84/8 86/6 88/25 89/1 89/12 language [9] 10/5 10/19 10/20 11/4 14/19 limits [1] 13/11 93/21 99/3 103/9 104/6 108/22 111/6 112/3 14/20 15/5 17/1 17/2 line [6] 15/22 50/25 72/24 80/2 84/7 90/17 113/1 113/15 113/21 large [3] 60/22 77/20 133/14 Line 20 [1] 72/24 man's [7] 75/16 77/1 80/11 87/15 87/23 88/1 last [32] 6/20 21/3 24/25 29/1 29/2 29/4 30/2 list [11] 116/22 116/23 131/24 131/25 132/1 89/8 59/7 59/8 59/9 59/11 60/17 63/24 72/7 72/10 132/5 132/24 132/25 133/3 133/9 133/19 mandatory [1] 136/13 72/14 78/22 79/11 81/5 82/23 82/25 88/12 many [19] 15/11 21/22 21/24 22/6 22/10 listed [1] 64/19 88/13 88/16 92/22 108/25 109/2 109/18 listen [6] 70/8 83/21 93/17 113/4 113/13 24/4 26/12 26/18 52/11 54/9 54/13 55/5 109/22 113/17 113/18 135/4 55/11 59/23 72/3 72/8 72/10 72/14 99/24 113/14 late [4] 43/2 70/2 87/3 87/4 lists |1] 135/10 mark [4] 133/6 133/19 134/20 135/11 later [8] 72/7 72/11 87/20 89/13 94/4 115/2 little [7] 46/19 57/1 85/5 87/7 95/17 133/13 marked [7] 35/8 45/8 131/6 131/7 131/13 121/22 138/13 146/6 131/17 131/21 latex [1] 25/4 LLP [1] 1/14 markers [1] 39/5 law [22] 1/22 16/17 76/1 107/20 109/15 loaded [2] 27/5 96/24 marking [1] 62/7 114/4 118/22 118/23 119/2 119/10 119/16 marshal [6] 117/2 128/8 130/17 135/7 135/8 local [1] 119/1 120/3 122/15 123/18 124/6 128/10 142/5 logic [3] 76/22 82/17 85/14 142/6 143/2 143/13 144/10 144/24 logical [3] 70/25 84/13 85/1 MARSHALL [42] 1/2 3/7 3/9 29/3 32/23 lawful [2] 10/22 120/19 logically [2] 75/6 112/17 44/8 44/8 71/4 72/19 73/5 73/9 74/20 75/9 lawfulness [1] 10/9 long [12] 19/4 22/19 24/8 46/23 46/25 52/20 76/6 76/16 79/22 79/24 79/24 80/22 81/8 laws [1] 119/18 69/9 70/3 96/1 113/17 136/2 143/4 81/21 83/14 84/14 84/15 84/17 84/19 86/16 lawsuit [3] 76/2 79/18 83/14 longer [5] 13/24 14/3 58/11 145/21 146/6 86/20 86/21 87/1 90/22 91/3 91/4 91/7 91/15 lawyer [1] 90/1 look [26] 60/14 71/20 72/9 72/12 72/18 92/10 96/23 97/17 98/7 110/18 112/5 125/19 lawyering [1] 132/8 Marshall's [9] 49/20 51/2 72/25 74/7 76/7 75/15 75/23 76/19 76/25 77/4 77/15 78/19 lawyers [2] 89/17 90/3 79/7 79/14 79/19 82/12 90/10 96/21 98/3 76/12 76/17 83/1 83/16 leading [2] 123/6 125/1 99/5 99/25 111/21 113/19 133/3 133/5 138/3 massive [1] 86/7 learned [5] 28/2 88/14 88/15 111/2 112/12 looking [7] 24/1 30/8 39/15 44/25 60/13 Master's [2] 53/5 54/25 least [5] 14/19 19/7 26/17 36/23 118/17 match [1] 108/12 89/11 137/25 leave [7] 7/7 37/22 42/22 43/17 43/18 loose [1] 79/10 material [2] 25/22 47/1 147/12 147/14 matter [14] 18/16 28/18 35/3 53/20 58/9 Lord [1] 88/8 leaves [1] 67/12 lose |2| 88/4 92/13 58/23 59/1 59/18 62/23 75/24 110/13 115/10 lecture [1] 53/18 loss [6] 7/2 126/18 136/21 138/4 138/12 133/15 143/23 lectures [3] 53/14 53/15 53/19 138/14 matter that |1| 133/15 led [2] 8/7 107/12 lot [5] 42/25 43/5 70/21 96/13 98/12 matters [1] 13/24 left [9] 39/16 42/21 43/3 81/23 81/25 96/15 may [58] 3/12 6/14 10/17 10/23 11/5 11/14 lunch [3] 93/23 94/5 94/6 96/16 104/4 104/5 lving [4] 15/18 99/15 99/23 118/4 12/19 15/12 19/7 20/3 20/5 22/22 23/17 legal [4] 4/6 5/9 7/25 8/13 30/11 31/13 36/3 36/23 42/4 50/25 55/20 M legitimate [1] 113/15 55/21 57/7 57/8 62/12 66/14 71/4 86/3 91/20 length [2] 139/22 143/1 machine [8] 34/3 34/5 37/14 37/17 37/21 92/1 93/4 101/19 102/9 104/25 114/10 less [4] 47/22 56/24 115/5 144/5 37/23 37/25 38/1 114/21 118/1 118/4 118/11 120/9 120/21 lesser [1] 140/11 made [30] 4/5 5/12 12/3 12/4 12/14 28/24 121/16 121/20 122/2 122/4 122/23 123/20 let [14] 12/12 34/11 36/12 64/16 75/24 79/7 37/22 66/25 73/14 74/9 80/17 87/12 87/14 127/11 127/13 127/19 127/23 128/1 128/3 84/23 89/2 110/5 132/16 134/13 134/16 93/19 95/16 98/13 103/15 107/11 112/25 128/5 128/5 132/25 136/3 141/8 144/17 145/10 146/5 115/19 115/22 117/3 117/3 118/16 118/20 May 15 [3] 30/11 36/23 50/25 let's [15] 11/22 25/5 71/20 72/18 72/22 119/12 121/17 130/16 144/4 145/22 May 15th [3] 22/22 71/4 120/9 75/15 76/9 79/19 91/22 92/5 100/2 102/7 made-up [1] 115/22 maybe [3] 25/8 29/1 86/24

magnitude [1] 137/10

mail [1] 2/3

me [36] 12/12 12/12 17/12 20/4 20/16 20/17

30/15 34/11 36/12 45/19 54/10 60/10 60/13

104/11 105/16 107/14

lettered [1] 134/2

Case: 12-2479 Document: 40-1 Page: 42 09/27/2012 731928

A1236

M me... [23] 61/18 64/16 71/2 78/6 78/12 80/3 84/23 110/5 114/4 117/1 128/8 128/17 128/18 129/23 130/2 134/13 134/16 140/6 140/9 140/17 144/7 144/11 145/10 Meade [5] 81/9 81/11 84/18 86/16 90/9 Meade's [4] 86/17 86/22 88/2 90/7 mean [22] 10/8 25/18 30/12 43/9 52/3 54/2 56/16 56/16 59/20 61/21 73/7 106/18 106/20 106/21 107/18 108/3 108/8 108/12 108/13 115/9 144/4 145/21 means [10] 38/19 54/3 56/18 88/5 98/7 99/14 101/12 102/2 108/10 114/25 measured [3] 9/12 9/22 121/19 medical [10] 16/6 18/21 18/25 51/23 51/25 52/9 52/21 53/24 108/5 145/9 meet [3] 89/17 92/13 111/13 meeting [4] 20/3 20/5 87/7 90/2 member [2] 53/21 53/22 members [4] 33/19 33/21 38/18 46/5 memo [11] 78/17 78/23 78/25 79/3 97/25 98/2 98/2 98/6 98/9 135/2 135/3 memory [4] 30/8 74/1 74/3 89/16 men [5] 87/5 87/6 101/5 101/6 110/16 mention [4] 4/19 44/7 64/22 78/4 mentioned [4] 31/8 31/20 41/17 110/25 mere [1] 110/7 merely [1] 126/1 merits [1] 4/14 mess [1] 88/24 message [9] 17/1 17/18 34/5 92/25 93/3 93/5 93/8 93/12 103/17 met [1] 115/13 metal [1] 96/7 Michael [5] 6/5 6/6 95/10 109/8 118/23 middle [4] 39/12 71/7 71/9 81/25 midnight [3] 33/23 33/25 43/2 might [5] 7/14 8/18 82/7 127/15 137/20 mind [7] 15/5 102/7 103/9 108/21 117/5 128/12 147/9 minds [1] 102/19 minor [1] 133/13 minute [8] 31/20 41/17 67/21 79/23 84/12 84/17 84/23 138/1 minutes [10] 19/8 19/12 19/13 19/14 33/6 68/24 105/8 113/23 142/15 142/16 misconduct [2] 127/13 127/21 misguided [1] 6/11 mislead [1] 92/20 misread [1] 130/6 missed [1] 82/7 missing [1] 84/4 misstatement [2] 143/13 144/9 mistake |2| 76/6 119/23 mistaken [7] 15/12 15/13 15/14 69/18 86/24 | national [1] 114/21 102/24 118/4 mistrial [3] 4/8 4/13 8/10 mixed [1] 47/20 modify [2] 4/17 144/7 molecular [1] 53/12 moment | 12 | 4/18 5/1 8/18 9/13 9/22 46/2 82/8 84/14 84/15 84/22 116/21 121/20 moments [2] 30/7 125/5 monetary [1] 137/11 money [4] 92/17 108/23 108/24 126/9 month [2] 26/15 59/9 months [6] 86/21 87/24 93/22 113/1 126/16 more [26] 5/19 9/8 17/22 18/10 18/25 24/21 39/11 56/25 57/1 66/13 76/25 81/18 85/8 106/2 110/15 112/7 112/8 114/15 115/11 116/7 125/13 128/4 136/22 141/1 144/4

145/22 morning [26] 3/22 20/14 20/15 21/6 21/7 28/14 28/15 33/12 37/12 37/18 37/19 37/20 38/20 43/3 51/18 51/19 58/18 58/19 70/13 71/24 82/5 83/3 83/24 98/21 107/15 147/8 most [5] 77/21 81/18 81/20 82/20 96/8 motion [7] 36/2 68/2 68/4 69/14 96/6 137/5 137/25 motions [2] 3/11 3/20 motivated [2] 123/7 123/13 motive [6] 104/5 106/6 108/22 108/22 108/23 110/5 move [5] 5/3 19/3 69/13 86/6 109/24 moved [1] 35/23 movement [3] 99/9 102/14 102/15 movements [5] 8/6 68/10 80/17 80/22 81/9 MR 121 58/17 66/16 Mr. [16] 29/3 56/6 66/6 66/6 72/19 72/25 73/5 73/9 76/7 84/14 86/16 90/22 97/5 97/17 110/18 112/5 Mr. Cohen [1] 66/6 Mr. Marshall [10] 29/3 72/19 73/5 73/9 84/14 86/16 90/22 97/17 110/18 112/5 Mr. Marshall's [2] 72/25 76/7 Mr. Norinsberg [2] 66/6 97/5 Mr. Ross' [1] 56/6 Mrs [1] 148/8 MS |3| 51/17 55/18 65/25 Ms. [5] 51/18 58/3 58/18 73/21 74/1 Ms. Lamouse-Smith [3] 51/18 58/3 58/18 Ms. Phillips [2] 73/21 74/1 much [13] 3/20 5/20 51/7 67/11 76/21 109/8 110/15 112/7 112/8 114/9 114/15 129/21 139/25 multiple [5] 3/10 3/20 47/12 71/5 97/6 must [17] 6/22 102/6 107/2 107/9 107/18 110/16 115/11 118/18 124/14 124/16 125/4 125/10 127/6 127/21 128/14 138/13 144/17 my [54] 3/13 3/16 5/1 11/4 15/24 16/2 16/16 16/23 16/25 18/9 18/20 19/3 23/4 24/24 24/24 26/2 26/10 33/12 33/14 35/16 35/18 37/10 41/1 41/19 44/25 44/25 52/24 53/20 54/25 57/7 58/6 60/22 64/3 64/13 65/19 66/10 67/1 74/3 78/6 78/22 80/2 90/1 91/2 95/10 95/11 101/2 108/25 137/3 137/5 137/25 141/24 143/2 143/16 144/20 myself [1] 114/16 mystery [1] 64/4

N-A-N-A [1] 51/14 name [4] 21/1 21/2 21/3 51/13 named [2] 56/5 96/23 names [1] 6/1 NANA [2] 51/9 51/14 near [1] 86/18 necessarily [2] 70/22 122/2 necessary [3] 3/24 20/6 138/9 need [4] 6/5 18/7 87/21 104/13 needed [2] 52/7 103/18 negative [3] 7/4 7/4 25/17 negligence [1] 119/23 neither [2] 114/14 126/12 never [26] 15/9 26/20 26/21 49/5 72/24 73/4 73/12 73/16 73/24 74/2 74/3 74/14 80/6 81/14 82/2 82/3 82/16 83/5 88/25 89/2 107/24 110/25 112/22 112/24 113/10 113/11 new [21] 1/1 1/5 1/6 1/16 1/16 1/22 1/23 1/23 3/3 3/8 14/8 21/9 52/18 53/16 55/15 72/14 83/4 119/5 120/2 122/15 136/11 news [1] 147/8 next [16] 29/6 51/7 61/19 61/24 67/23 75/8

75/8 76/4 88/9 94/7 97/14 113/25 134/21 134/22 140/16 146/13 night [11] 33/22 34/2 88/8 89/9 97/9 112/23 115/23 117/12 117/19 120/18 147/11 nighttime [1] 43/21 no [163] Nobody |2] 100/23 121/6 Nobody's [1] 115/5 nod [1] 20/18 nodding [11] 115/16 116/13 125/9 127/4 139/11 139/15 139/24 140/5 140/21 140/24 141/16 nominal [14] 136/15 136/22 137/9 138/17 138/17 138/20 138/23 138/23 143/4 143/5 143/8 143/14 143/20 145/1 non [1] 21/19 non-fatal [1] 21/19 none [3] 26/19 51/6 104/8 nonsense [3] 87/8 87/10 100/22 NORINSBERG [3] 1/18 66/6 97/5 normal [3] 56/25 66/23 90/11 normally [1] 34/19 North [2] 21/12 101/4 not [181] note [18] 7/15 17/16 17/21 19/21 24/10 69/10 99/2 117/1 117/2 128/8 131/2 135/17 135/24 139/4 141/14 143/24 146/4 146/5 noted [1] 38/16 notes [5] 30/8 56/10 56/11 144/12 145/12 nothing [5] 58/13 87/24 90/10 114/17 132/1 notion [2] 109/16 110/5 now [113] 3/3 3/4 4/2 5/8 5/20 6/8 7/12 8/11 14/1 16/18 17/17 20/17 30/21 36/19 40/14 44/10 46/5 46/22 47/24 48/23 49/14 58/9 59/24 60/11 61/15 62/1 64/25 67/19 70/5 70/23 71/2 71/4 71/20 71/23 73/4 74/19 74/20 75/23 77/1 77/13 77/14 81/3 82/5 82/14 82/17 83/6 83/11 84/2 86/14 86/23 91/1 91/6 91/21 92/14 93/24 93/25 95/14 95/18 95/24 96/11 96/18 96/20 97/10 97/25 98/2 98/12 98/14 99/13 99/19 100/22 101/1 101/10 101/22 101/22 102/21 103/1 103/11 104/2 105/6 105/16 106/12 106/17 106/25 107/1 107/10 107/14 107/16 108/6 108/20 108/25 110/22 111/13 111/22 112/12 114/5 115/7 116/19 117/14 118/24 120/6 121/1 128/24 131/1 134/14 134/16 140/16 141/13 143/2 143/7 144/8 145/18 146/2 147/4 now's [1] 84/21 nowhere [2] 99/2 109/25 number [11] 6/5 45/11 60/22 74/6 74/8 79/19 81/11 89/6 96/24 98/6 134/18 Number 1 [1] 98/6 nyed.uscourts.gov [1] 2/3 NYPD [7] 30/22 32/11 34/6 42/18 55/22

65/8 74/12

oath [11] 72/10 73/6 75/16 75/21 76/3 79/1 79/9 79/20 80/13 86/5 86/25 object [20] 10/8 10/19 17/15 19/22 19/23 68/10 72/24 73/5 75/10 75/12 75/16 75/18 75/20 96/5 102/11 105/21 137/7 142/13 142/24 144/8 objected [1] 15/24 objection [36] 7/16 16/2 17/16 17/21 25/24 31/11 31/11 35/24 36/5 36/5 36/13 42/1 43/15 43/24 44/4 47/2 48/8 49/17 50/1 64/6 65/14 66/8 66/20 67/9 91/25 93/2 104/23 135/19 141/17 141/18 141/19 141/20 142/4 143/17 145/12 145/15 objections [3] 7/13 117/3 130/16 objectively [1] 121/11

Case: 12-2479 Document: 40-1 Page: 43 09/27/2012 731928 126

A1237

83/17 86/9 86/9 86/10 86/10 87/12 88/4 132/11 140/9 0 one [96] 5/13 9/8 10/4 11/25 17/22 18/10 89/12 91/13 145/12 objects [2] 17/3 50/15 24/21 27/18 32/16 32/17 34/11 34/12 39/11 overcome [2] 6/15 123/21 overrule [1] 17/15 obligation [1] 16/16 39/13 43/13 52/5 58/8 59/23 60/11 63/2 obligatory [1] 136/13 Overruled [1] 20/2 63/19 66/13 68/16 69/22 71/3 71/6 71/13 72/7 74/8 74/25 78/22 78/23 79/5 79/17 observation [1] 120/21 overtime [1] 78/18 observations [4] 10/22 81/19 103/22 121/18 own [7] 31/23 31/25 76/5 78/19 81/4 109/4 79/19 81/9 81/13 81/24 82/6 82/7 84/10 observe [2] 80/19 80/22 84/23 86/17 86/17 87/13 88/10 89/1 89/4 114/23 observed [11] 4/11 7/22 58/3 68/9 69/15 89/4 89/6 89/8 90/5 90/9 90/10 91/21 92/22 owned [2] 87/1 87/17 80/17 99/11 101/6 102/10 105/21 120/23 93/25 94/1 95/21 100/6 100/16 101/6 104/3 104/21 105/1 106/2 108/15 108/21 110/14 observer [1] 19/5 obtain [1] 44/10 p.m [5] 95/3 113/24 131/1 147/3 147/15 110/16 110/17 110/17 113/5 113/18 116/7 obviously [2] 12/4 120/14 116/10 118/16 121/14 121/14 121/20 124/24 packaged [1] 27/23 packages [1] 27/24 occasion [1] 117/24 125/13 125/23 126/4 126/6 127/5 128/5 occupation [1] 114/22 130/20 132/11 133/13 134/21 134/22 135/4 packaging [1] 56/10 occurred [6] 57/17 57/19 96/2 115/23 Packet [1] 143/25 136/7 138/1 143/12 122/17 125/21 one-way [1] 89/8 page [35] 5/22 5/24 6/8 6/19 6/20 6/24 7/3 occurrence [1] 96/22 ones [2] 113/14 113/19 8/21 8/24 9/10 9/10 11/2 11/8 12/16 13/18 14/14 15/5 15/7 17/23 29/6 60/13 60/14 only [23] 5/11 11/25 33/17 37/11 68/23 odds [1] 87/13 60/17 67/23 72/23 75/15 80/21 94/7 113/25 off [21] 18/6 27/10 41/25 42/8 50/4 50/9 68/25 76/2 82/2 85/13 89/24 100/16 101/8 130/8 130/9 130/11 146/13 148/3 148/13 50/16 58/7 82/14 86/20 88/6 94/4 95/8 95/15 101/10 103/1 104/9 108/21 112/5 112/16 95/18 95/19 99/8 100/2 100/2 105/15 142/21 113/2 116/6 126/12 127/5 127/7 Page 9 [1] 15/5 Pages [1] 138/3 open [7] 3/1 86/4 89/10 92/3 128/19 130/10 offer [1] 55/18 office [24] 18/21 37/17 37/24 51/23 51/25 147/9 paid [1] 95/9 52/9 52/20 53/24 55/22 61/2 61/13 62/24 open-and-shut [2] 86/4 92/3 painstakingly [1] 15/12 63/21 64/17 65/2 65/13 65/17 66/2 68/24 panel [1] 113/2 opened [3] 4/3 4/3 7/19 89/2 104/19 105/18 105/25 108/6 opening [7] 75/3 92/3 98/15 98/15 101/2 panicked [1] 86/17 pants [5] 58/4 75/17 75/19 75/21 75/22 officer [139] 7/9 9/19 9/20 20/20 21/2 21/6 111/24 117/13 21/9 23/9 23/10 23/14 23/22 23/25 24/10 papers [2] 137/6 137/25 opinion [7] 12/16 18/16 18/20 18/23 18/24 paperwork [17] 24/24 40/21 40/24 41/20 25/3 28/7 28/8 28/9 28/9 28/14 29/3 29/4 55/20 58/6 30/21 31/20 32/5 32/21 32/24 36/17 36/19 45/1 76/25 77/4 80/14 96/12 96/13 96/18 opinions [1] 118/12 98/19 99/2 99/4 103/14 147/13 147/14 37/10 39/12 40/14 40/15 41/4 41/24 42/3 opportunity [5] 15/11 36/17 92/24 108/25 paragraph [13] 6/9 6/9 8/22 8/23 8/24 9/1 43/9 43/14 43/23 44/3 44/6 44/11 45/21 117/18 9/2 9/11 9/11 11/2 11/8 15/7 60/17 47/11 48/4 48/10 48/12 48/20 48/23 49/14 opposed [1] 137/8 49/22 50/10 50/25 68/9 68/11 68/12 68/23 opposite [1] 11/20 paragraphs [1] 6/24 71/22 71/23 71/23 71/24 72/5 75/11 76/7 Pardon [1] 20/4 oppressively [1] 127/18 76/19 77/1 77/2 77/3 77/6 78/25 79/15 81/13 parole [1] 102/9 order [7] 4/7 4/10 49/14 54/21 70/23 107/21 part [13] 30/21 32/8 46/6 73/2 83/7 90/5 81/13 82/9 82/9 82/19 84/16 84/23 84/25 139/9 100/11 104/3 104/4 104/12 104/17 125/16 85/11 85/11 86/8 88/22 89/20 89/21 89/24 ordered [1] 114/9 93/7 93/9 93/13 95/18 96/2 96/11 97/4 97/9 144/1 ordinance [1] 119/3 98/1 98/14 98/18 98/18 98/20 98/21 99/8 origin |1| 114/21 parted [1] 100/4 particular [8] 33/2 57/14 58/21 77/13 82/23 100/18 101/4 102/11 102/13 102/16 102/16 original [3] 135/24 143/16 145/1 103/6 103/7 103/8 103/16 103/25 103/25 originally [3] 58/11 65/12 144/22 89/15 115/8 127/6 105/6 105/14 105/16 107/23 109/17 111/17 parties [3] 71/11 114/21 143/17 other [39] 12/10 12/22 33/19 56/20 64/16 112/2 112/10 121/14 121/16 121/17 121/25 partner [4] 35/16 37/10 86/9 103/17 71/12 73/14 75/24 78/14 78/15 79/7 79/14 81/3 84/10 85/4 92/10 92/19 93/6 93/9 93/12 parts [3] 65/11 65/17 99/24 122/3 125/11 125/11 129/2 129/4 129/6 129/8 129/12 129/19 129/20 129/21 129/22 100/11 103/3 110/2 110/15 110/17 113/6 party [3] 115/13 119/11 135/20 129/22 130/11 148/4 117/17 117/22 118/1 118/13 119/7 119/23 party's [1] 115/10 Officer Fox [1] 68/12 pass [1] 77/17 125/7 128/11 128/13 130/16 138/5 138/10 officer's [3] 69/14 109/25 121/12 142/14 passenger [1] 76/11 officers [55] 5/24 8/4 8/6 8/7 8/13 15/7 other police [1] 93/9 past [2] 17/2 110/24 path [1] 15/13 16/17 28/8 37/22 42/12 44/1 69/23 81/4 others [1] 127/15 81/19 84/4 85/6 86/5 86/24 88/3 90/10 90/15 otherwise [5] 12/23 47/4 87/8 127/15 145/12 patrol [3] 32/5 43/23 101/5 91/11 92/17 95/10 99/2 99/14 100/12 100/16 our [21] 7/15 17/16 17/21 19/22 27/5 37/13 patrolman [1] 22/18 100/17 101/13 101/18 102/8 102/9 102/22 53/17 56/19 56/22 56/24 61/17 66/2 79/8 pause [1] 3/18 103/2 103/13 104/13 104/19 106/4 106/20 91/19 93/15 95/15 111/9 134/2 136/14 144/2 paying [2] 70/16 89/10 106/21 106/23 107/11 108/3 108/13 109/7 penal [1] 122/15 147/12 people [11] 15/16 47/12 54/5 73/14 83/21 110/8 110/13 112/22 113/17 115/3 118/22 ourselves [3] 42/25 43/1 43/6 120/2 123/24 124/12 87/9 87/10 92/20 118/14 118/25 128/13 out [82] 3/16 6/6 7/4 15/14 23/5 27/4 27/23 officers' [3] 4/6 102/19 103/22 32/12 35/13 35/14 35/16 38/23 39/4 43/6 people's [1] 117/23 per [5] 21/22 21/23 22/4 22/5 91/20 official [2] 2/1 5/25 46/15 48/21 56/7 66/23 67/22 73/12 75/9 officials [1] 119/2 perfect |2| 70/22 90/8 75/10 75/13 75/17 75/19 75/20 75/22 76/2 often [6] 15/16 18/21 32/15 34/20 60/12 perfectly |3| 42/17 86/20 102/23 76/23 77/5 77/7 77/17 77/21 77/22 78/13 78/14 78/18 79/23 80/16 81/22 82/7 83/3 perform [2] 52/5 56/22 oh [4] 15/14 46/18 48/11 67/6 83/16 84/17 84/24 85/9 85/12 85/13 86/7 performed |8| 21/24 22/7 25/16 54/15 55/1 okay [22] 6/1 24/23 30/17 38/8 39/17 40/8 87/14 88/9 88/18 89/5 89/16 91/9 91/12 93/7 55/5 56/21 56/24 40/13 46/2 50/14 59/9 59/22 60/16 67/21 93/9 96/5 97/14 98/4 98/14 98/19 99/7 99/7 period [1] 4/11 84/21 84/24 93/7 93/9 93/13 113/22 130/15 permit [2] 17/14 126/23 99/8 99/9 100/13 102/9 104/4 104/5 110/9 134/13 147/8 permitted |4| 4/1 4/15 4/19 124/8 110/14 112/1 112/7 113/24 117/5 119/12 omission [2] 125/15 125/18 person [21] 33/17 37/11 56/4 88/7 88/7 124/4 124/5 127/24 136/16 outside [9] 3/12 13/11 19/11 30/7 54/6 118/6 90/11 99/22 99/23 108/21 112/6 118/2 119/3 omissions [1] 85/24 119/7 119/15 120/10 122/1 122/11 123/1 on-the-job [1] 22/15 118/8 128/7 142/17 once [7] 25/2 37/22 66/24 103/14 112/22 over [16] 3/19 15/8 27/15 66/18 67/2 75/7 123/17 124/6 124/19

Case: 12-2479 Document: 40-1 Page: 44 09/27/2012 731928 126

A1238

101/12 102/8 103/23 104/14 106/22 110/8 pointed [1] 99/8 pointing [1] 85/13 110/10 110/21 116/15 116/17 120/1 121/2 person's [1] 123/15 points [3] 7/16 95/16 109/13 121/4 121/8 121/15 121/16 121/19 121/23 122/2 122/8 123/4 123/11 123/14 123/20 persona [1] 124/5 police [32] 9/19 20/20 21/2 21/9 21/10 23/9 personal [4] 78/22 106/5 114/20 124/5 27/24 37/10 76/18 77/20 82/21 83/4 84/5 123/21 123/24 124/9 124/12 124/15 125/18 personally [3] 23/10 54/10 56/1 84/13 84/14 84/19 84/21 84/22 85/11 86/5 probably [6] 22/10 27/10 54/14 88/8 110/17 115/11 perspective [1] 8/8 90/12 93/7 93/9 93/13 95/10 98/21 100/6 problem [3] 88/6 126/10 142/19 pertain [1] 101/18 100/7 109/7 115/3 120/2 121/14 pertains [1] 105/14 policies [1] 53/9 problems [3] 70/3 86/8 88/20 Phillips [3] 73/20 73/21 74/1 procedure [2] 14/11 82/21 portion [2] 138/11 145/23 phone [1] 145/12 procedures [2] 53/9 55/3 portions [1] 114/11 phony [1] 79/5 position [7] 7/19 51/25 100/8 112/9 142/2 proceed [4] 45/19 70/10 95/4 123/16 photo [2] 24/18 24/21 142/7 142/9 proceeding [3] 14/16 123/5 123/6 photograph [3] 23/15 23/23 24/10 positive [5] 15/17 25/19 26/18 27/9 28/3 proceedings [9] 2/5 3/6 73/11 123/2 123/3 photographs [2] 21/21 23/15 possessed [3] 27/4 121/9 122/14 123/8 123/11 123/13 147/16 photos [2] 24/23 24/24 possesses [1] 122/12 process [11] 22/24 23/7 25/7 25/8 33/9 38/25 phrased [2] 15/25 141/11 possession [29] 21/19 27/3 43/8 56/8 72/19 41/8 49/2 51/1 54/20 124/6 |physical [4] 72/25 73/3 73/5 84/8 72/21 72/25 73/3 73/5 73/9 73/13 73/17 processed [1] 24/2 pick [2] 42/7 44/2 73/22 74/2 74/7 74/13 74/21 83/23 96/23 produce [1] 26/2 picked [2] 41/24 121/6 98/8 106/16 111/6 112/15 112/19 121/5 produced [1] 2/5 pieture [1] 23/22 121/13 122/12 122/14 122/21 professional [2] 53/21 132/8 piece [3] 70/24 111/15 121/20 possessions [1] 31/6 profile [4] 61/11 64/8 64/10 64/14 pieces [1] 75/4 possibilities [1] 71/6 program [1] 55/1 pin [1] 104/6 possibility [2] 71/14 86/24 prompt [1] 142/18 |pitch [1] 102/15 possible [11] 34/15 48/7 58/6 58/10 64/15 proof [7] 92/8 101/22 101/24 102/1 107/13 pitching [1] 96/6 64/16 65/7 74/18 74/19 82/18 141/11 115/7 115/14 place [4] 7/5 96/22 113/10 130/20 possibly [1] 145/11 proper [1] 142/5 placed [2] 98/7 120/25 potentially [2] 61/11 64/13 properly [2] 4/10 136/5 property [5] 45/2 45/5 45/25 46/2 52/16 plain [1] 84/11 power [1] 75/23 |plaintiff [93] 1/3 1/13 1/15 4/2 4/5 4/12 4/16 | practice [2] 27/5 50/20 propose [2] 5/21 6/9 5/8 6/25 7/22 8/1 8/8 11/3 12/24 13/22 14/5 proposed [6] 5/2 5/21 9/2 10/3 10/3 14/19 precedence [1] 14/13 precinct [9] 21/15 22/18 23/2 34/17 39/9 15/23 32/23 36/5 66/5 68/10 68/12 69/15 proposition [1] 143/12 96/5 97/21 98/24 99/10 99/23 101/14 101/19 40/15 103/12 103/14 103/19 prosecute [4] 106/11 123/14 129/4 129/6 102/4 102/11 102/12 102/21 103/1 103/2 predates [2] 61/9 143/7 prosecuted [5] 90/24 104/14 116/5 123/1 103/11 103/12 104/1 105/21 106/4 106/5 predetermined [1] 39/4 124/20 106/7 106/12 107/2 107/10 108/9 109/11 prefab [1] 39/13 prosecuting [5] 73/16 73/18 91/18 122/20 115/4 115/18 115/24 116/3 116/4 116/5 preferred [4] 42/20 42/21 43/18 47/22 124/13 116/8 116/14 116/18 118/20 119/7 119/16 prejudice [2] 117/9 128/23 prosecution [23] 5/4 6/14 6/16 11/9 12/3 120/4 120/8 120/11 120/13 120/13 120/15 preliminary [1] 13/6 12/23 68/23 69/6 69/9 104/12 104/18 105/10 121/5 121/7 121/13 121/22 122/17 122/20 premised [1] 122/11 105/13 106/3 106/24 115/23 122/16 123/16 123/7 123/25 124/11 124/18 124/24 125/10 preparation [9] 11/17 12/25 68/25 69/4 123/20 123/22 123/25 124/1 138/8 125/20 125/23 126/5 126/8 126/13 126/15 105/4 105/8 122/24 125/6 129/10 prosecutor [28] 6/21 11/14 11/15 11/21 13/4 127/10 127/16 127/22 127/24 128/25 129/2 66/2 69/4 69/8 73/20 74/6 74/7 74/22 74/22 preparatory [1] 13/5 129/5 129/7 145/3 prepare [2] 62/18 67/1 93/13 105/4 105/7 105/17 107/4 107/7 112/6 plaintiff's [52] 10/2 17/17 19/22 19/24 35/9 prepared [7] 35/2 35/5 45/2 60/5 78/10 112/25 122/24 125/1 125/3 125/5 129/10 78/11 82/12 35/23 36/16 45/9 62/1 62/11 68/6 68/14 129/14 130/13 95/16 95/19 95/24 96/21 97/4 98/5 98/15 preponderance [1] 102/2 prosecutors [9] 11/6 63/25 87/19 91/11 99/1 99/5 99/13 100/22 101/9 104/2 104/3 prerequisite [1] 136/1 91/12 91/12 91/20 108/16 116/2 104/11 105/12 106/25 107/16 107/19 108/2 present [9] 12/20 20/3 20/5 20/7 61/11 65/8 protocols [4] 34/6 42/18 55/3 111/9 109/2 116/1 122/11 123/9 125/1 129/8 70/25 78/2 124/13 prove [6] 83/15 92/9 107/2 113/15 116/17 129/12 130/12 133/22 133/22 133/23 133/23 presented [12] 6/21 6/21 11/21 14/22 86/11 125/11 133/24 133/24 133/24 133/25 134/16 138/9 102/4 107/3 107/7 107/7 124/25 125/2 125/3 proved [2] 125/25 126/14 139/19 142/2 proven [5] 115/8 120/5 124/24 125/23 126/4 presenting [4] 116/2 129/9 129/13 130/13 plaintiffs [5] 7/19 8/3 14/2 108/15 110/22 presiding [1] 3/4 provide [1] 45/11 plan [2] 16/20 16/24 presumed [1] 14/21 provided [1] 45/16 play [10] 80/10 96/25 97/1 97/23 97/25 presumption [9] 4/25 6/13 6/15 13/19 13/24 provides [1] 118/23 98/10 98/17 98/23 108/9 108/19 14/1 14/16 123/19 123/21 providing [1] 122/18 played [1] 125/15 pretrial [1] 7/24 proving [2] 116/14 125/20 playing [1] 79/10 pretty [1] 85/10 proximally [2] 125/14 126/6 pleasant [1] 147/11 prewritten [1] 39/18 proximate [6] 6/19 119/19 125/12 125/13 please [32] 20/19 20/25 21/8 23/25 25/5 primary [1] 71/17 126/14 139/18 27/12 30/16 36/3 36/12 37/9 46/10 46/22 print [1] 25/22 prudence [1] 123/17 51/8 51/12 53/3 67/20 67/21 70/5 70/10 prints [7] 25/22 49/20 82/10 82/13 83/1 psychological [7] 4/16 7/1 15/23 16/1 16/2 84/23 95/4 113/12 114/2 130/17 131/25 103/20 108/3 126/17 126/19 131/25 132/1 132/25 134/13 135/9 147/2 prior [11] 4/7 4/10 22/16 52/23 57/12 57/14 psychology [1] 15/18 147/4 72/1 72/5 97/6 122/4 131/12 pull [8] 8/1 75/9 75/10 75/17 75/22 77/22 pledges [1] 93/19 private [2] 20/11 130/19 81/22 96/5 plus [2] 134/20 135/6 privilege [2] 119/9 119/17 pulled [3] 75/12 75/18 75/20 PO [2] 6/4 6/6 privileged [4] 120/17 120/18 121/2 121/14 pulling [4] 58/3 77/7 84/13 101/6 point [26] 7/18 10/1 12/9 17/13 32/15 46/9 privileges [1] 119/9 punish [2] 124/6 127/24 47/8 68/3 69/22 70/20 73/3 77/25 82/7 84/2 probabilities [1] 115/12 punitive [35] 7/9 7/10 16/25 17/4 92/23 90/1 98/4 99/7 99/7 99/9 102/14 110/23 probable [43] 5/1 6/14 6/15 9/12 9/18 9/22 92/24 127/10 127/12 127/19 127/20 127/23 110/24 135/21 136/7 136/17 142/8 9/24 13/19 14/17 14/20 68/8 68/18 101/11 128/1 128/3 128/4 129/21 135/18 136/1

Case: 12-2479 Document: 40-1 Page: 45 09/27/2012 731928 126

A1239

reason [21] 4/21 30/5 59/1 68/18 77/14 89/7 | religion [1] 114/21 96/11 100/5 101/8 103/23 104/5 104/7 104/8 reluctance [1] 13/12 punitive... |18| 136/2 137/22 139/5 140/1 104/8 104/9 105/12 106/10 107/25 110/5 rely [5] 18/17 75/14 88/21 117/6 121/16 140/2 141/1 141/5 141/6 141/6 141/25 143/3 119/24 139/21 remaining [1] 66/3 143/6 143/12 143/15 143/20 143/23 143/24 reasonable [8] 9/20 101/13 101/24 109/20 remarks [2] 95/14 109/13 121/11 122/1 123/17 126/11 remember [25] 30/12 30/13 30/18 30/19 144/22 purpose [3] 23/6 124/3 126/8 reasonableness [2] 69/17 117/20 30/20 40/20 48/16 48/19 72/11 72/13 73/15 74/18 78/23 80/15 81/16 81/17 81/18 82/1 push [1] 46/15 reasonably |3| 8/12 125/18 126/13 put [32] 5/23 6/1 6/9 6/12 7/6 11/5 14/20 82/1 89/12 89/20 96/1 109/17 109/21 111/17 reasoning [2] 76/23 84/11 31/20 31/23 31/25 71/16 75/4 77/23 77/24 reasons [4] 95/21 95/22 106/23 107/23 remembers [1] 89/15 85/20 85/23 85/23 85/24 86/1 91/13 92/18 rebut [2] 14/21 122/7 remove [4] 81/21 102/11 102/13 105/21 96/17 100/8 105/24 112/16 112/18 114/20 rebuttal [2] 67/15 109/11 removed [1] 145/25 115/10 117/5 132/3 132/5 136/15 removing |1| 68/10 rebutted [2] 6/15 123/21 putting [2] 9/6 93/21 recall [6] 41/15 48/6 48/22 97/18 97/20 render [1] 128/22 117/20 renew [3] 36/7 68/4 69/14 receive [5] 54/24 55/22 66/5 66/6 101/15 reopen [1] 4/22 qualified [2] 69/13 69/19 received [22] 22/24 36/16 37/16 37/18 53/7 repeatedly [6] 4/22 8/3 16/15 17/2 86/25 guarter [2] 93/25 94/1 53/8 54/21 54/25 56/11 64/17 64/19 66/1 95/25 question [48] 15/25 17/23 17/25 34/11 61/19 131/8 131/10 131/14 131/18 131/22 133/7 report [48] 18/20 35/2 35/12 35/14 40/14 61/24 64/13 65/10 66/13 66/14 69/24 71/13 133/20 135/13 144/13 146/10 44/22 57/4 57/6 57/9 57/10 57/11 57/12 72/23 72/24 75/16 80/21 82/9 91/5 91/17 recent [2] 5/5 61/2 59/16 59/25 60/2 60/9 60/11 60/15 66/23 97/13 97/14 97/16 97/18 100/15 101/10 67/1 67/3 67/4 77/12 77/21 77/23 77/24 78/4 recently [1] 63/2 102/21 111/24 117/6 117/6 117/7 117/14 recess [5] 20/12 94/6 132/21 135/15 146/12 78/5 78/7 78/10 78/11 78/16 78/16 78/18 121/6 123/23 124/23 130/7 130/9 137/21 81/1 82/12 96/14 96/20 98/13 99/6 110/1 recieved [1] 135/16 139/9 139/12 140/1 140/25 141/2 141/2 reckless [2] 119/25 127/21 110/4 110/24 110/25 128/18 134/18 134/19 141/7 141/10 141/22 142/11 147/12 recklessly [1] 119/14 134/23 questioned [3] 89/20 97/4 100/21 recognize [5] 35/9 35/11 45/21 45/23 45/23 report's [1] 78/3 questioning [2] 70/22 112/6 recognized [1] 136/2 reported [1] 66/23 questions [33] 7/4 8/5 17/24 28/11 38/23 recognizes [1] 62/12 reporter [4] 2/1 2/1 21/1 51/13 62/5 62/6 65/20 67/10 72/6 72/7 90/18 90/22 recognizing [1] 138/4 reports [9] 38/22 52/7 66/17 66/22 78/13 91/1 91/6 91/22 92/6 92/6 92/8 92/11 97/6 recollection [9] 30/11 30/12 33/11 41/1 42/5 84/5 85/24 109/23 109/23 42/9 44/25 45/6 63/6 97/11 97/13 101/17 101/20 103/24 105/13 request [22] 4/7 4/23 5/17 7/12 10/15 19/22 112/5 116/7 116/20 128/24 129/15 129/16 recommendations [1] 144/20 19/24 37/6 37/22 55/22 66/2 66/5 66/6 66/24 quick [2] 85/22 147/12 reconsider [1] 5/7 82/19 98/12 98/13 98/22 103/15 103/18 quite [2] 29/2 78/1 record [3] 7/15 69/10 142/21 132/11 132/19 quote [1] 138/3 requested [7] 10/14 18/13 37/1 37/20 38/4 recorded [1] 2/5 quoted [1] 138/4 recover [1] 125/19 82/13 82/16 quoting |2| 12/15 60/14 recovered [7] 22/22 24/4 26/20 26/21 65/1 required [5] 6/10 53/11 116/8 122/3 124/8 65/11 82/10 requires [3] 8/9 18/16 75/3 recovery [3] 7/1 126/16 126/18 requisite [1] 107/8 R-E-H-B-E-R-G [1] 5/6 RECROSS [2] 66/15 148/10 research [5] 18/15 114/23 135/20 144/20 race [1] 114/21 **RECROSS-EXAMINATION [1] 66/15** 147/7 raise [1] 16/12 redact [3] 36/5 36/9 36/10 reserve [1] 41/14 ran |1| 100/13 redacted [1] 36/12 reserved [1] 57/2 Randall [48] 3/9 6/4 6/6 7/10 23/9 23/10 redaction [2] 36/8 36/13 respect [28] 5/12 7/16 7/18 11/2 12/6 13/17 25/3 28/9 29/3 31/20 32/24 40/15 44/6 48/5 REDIRECT [3] 65/24 148/5 148/9 15/4 15/5 15/25 16/3 16/13 18/12 22/9 34/6 48/10 48/12 68/9 71/22 71/23 71/24 81/13 refer [1] 57/7 35/2 35/15 36/4 36/25 59/18 63/6 65/1 68/4 88/21 89/24 95/11 95/18 96/3 97/4 97/9 98/1 reference [2] 93/10 112/10 68/22 95/18 105/12 111/22 142/2 144/25 98/14 98/18 98/19 98/20 102/13 103/6 referenced [2] 7/20 137/5 respectful [1] 128/11 103/25 105/16 109/8 109/17 111/17 118/22 references [1] 5/12 respond [2] 21/18 35/13 125/11 128/25 129/4 129/8 129/20 129/22 referred [2] 50/11 99/9 responded [1] 33/9 130/12 referring [3] 11/7 40/8 40/10 response [2] 37/1 38/3 Randall's [2] 96/12 135/3 reframe [1] 12/24 responsibilities [1] 21/16 rapid [1] 70/21 refresh [7] 33/10 41/1 44/25 45/5 63/5 74/1 responsible [2] 93/21 127/5 rapid-fire [1] 70/21 74/3 rest [1] 10/6 rate [1] 18/19 refreshed [1] 89/16 restraint [1] 138/8 rather [3] 14/23 129/22 141/9 refreshing |1| 30/8 rests [1] 67/17 rational [1] 117/11 refuse |1| 128/3 result [7] 14/8 27/9 49/5 93/20 126/14 rationally [1] 117/9 refute [3] 100/23 105/23 109/3 138/10 144/24 re [2] 51/5 65/22 refuted [1] 105/11 results [8] 25/15 25/17 26/18 27/25 47/13 re-direct [2] 51/5 65/22 regard [1] 122/10 54/20 63/8 63/11 reach [3] 18/5 88/18 146/6 regarding [7] 38/11 53/17 54/3 55/3 66/18 retire |1| 108/20 reached [2] 128/18 128/20 67/1 115/22 review [6] 36/17 46/2 52/6 57/12 57/14 read [15] 3/21 6/20 10/21 12/12 18/9 70/9 regular [2] 35/5 63/14 72/23 113/23 114/3 116/21 131/4 137/16 regulation [1] 119/4 reviewed [7] 46/5 62/24 63/2 66/24 133/10 142/5 144/24 147/8 133/11 143/25 Rehberg [4] 5/5 11/4 11/18 12/9 reads [3] 8/25 98/6 130/11 relates [2] 10/17 13/6 reviewing [1] 63/5 ready [2] 19/19 142/22 relating [4] 10/5 10/16 10/22 120/21 revolver [3] 23/13 26/8 27/19 real [5] 90/1 107/21 107/21 111/24 141/2 relation [1] 81/9 ride [1] 103/13

release [3] 27/20 44/23 46/13

relevant [4] 101/10 122/5 122/13 122/19

releases [2] 46/13 46/15

relied [2] 8/13 72/2

right [124] 5/15 8/1 9/1 9/17 9/23 11/23

14/7 16/7 17/7 17/8 18/8 24/3 30/8 30/14

31/1 31/21 31/24 32/1 32/6 32/10 32/20

32/25 33/3 34/18 35/6 36/13 36/15 36/24

realize [2] 70/15 79/15

86/14 86/14 90/3

really [15] 4/25 47/14 70/19 71/3 72/20

74/18 77/16 77/19 78/15 81/24 83/14 85/16

Case: 12-2479 Document: 40-1 Page: 46 09/27/2012 731928 126

A1240

R right... [96] 37/21 38/5 38/5 38/9 38/11 38/12 38/14 39/2 39/3 39/21 40/1 40/16 41/3 41/6 41/18 41/21 41/22 42/8 43/9 43/13 43/23 45/13 45/19 46/11 46/12 46/13 46/14 46/16 46/19 46/19 49/16 49/22 50/4 50/21 50/23 50/24 59/7 59/15 59/18 61/10 61/13 63/12 63/15 63/18 63/22 64/5 66/3 66/12 66/19 67/18 70/23 76/9 77/10 77/15 79/13 80/3 81/20 81/22 81/22 81/25 83/11 84/21 84/25 85/1 87/15 88/24 89/22 90/24 93/20 97/5 98/10 105/17 107/1 108/22 113/20 113/21 114/2 116/1 116/6 119/17 120/6 124/19 124/20 129/9 129/13 129/18 130/12 134/6 134/18 136/12 136/14 136/19 136/23 139/8 141/21 145/20 right-hand [1] 38/11 rights [7] 118/22 119/1 119/8 127/22 138/18 139/20 139/21 rigorous [1] 56/25 ripe [1] 113/8 rise [2] 3/2 25/12 robberies [2] 21/19 31/5 Robinson [6] 135/22 143/2 143/5 143/7 143/11 144/24 rod [4] 46/14 46/17 46/18 64/21 rods [2] 44/21 44/24 room [9] 13/12 71/14 91/23 99/23 112/6 114/6 125/6 128/7 147/9 Ross |1| 56/5 Ross' [1] 56/6 32/15 Rothstein [1] 14/13 rotted [1] 87/23 roughly [2] 22/8 43/2 routine [1] 82/20 RPR [1] 2/1 rubbcd [1] 58/9 rubber [1] 24/7 rulc [5] 12/19 13/8 14/15 68/4 127/8 rules [1] 4/21 ruling [4] 7/24 16/18 17/6 144/3 rulings [2] 7/16 117/3 run [1] 94/4 S-E-N-A [1] 21/3 safeguard |2| 34/10 34/12 safeguarded [1] 34/15 said [75] 5/13 11/5 11/14 11/18 11/19 11/20 13/24 14/2 14/22 31/5 42/3 62/14 62/16 69/3 69/4 72/20 72/21 73/4 73/10 73/15 73/20 73/24 73/25 74/3 74/10 74/14 74/15 74/16 74/17 74/21 74/24 75/11 75/12 77/1 77/6 77/13 78/9 78/10 78/24 78/24 79/22 80/16 80/18 80/19 80/21 82/11 84/14 84/18 86/17 89/12 92/3 96/7 98/1 100/14 100/22 100/24

103/2 105/19 105/20 105/23 109/22 111/8 111/18 111/20 112/13 114/17 117/23 118/1 118/2 118/5 118/8 122/22 122/23 124/7 135/19 Salim [5] 6/4 6/6 95/11 109/8 118/22 same [10] 7/11 9/10 10/15 53/18 105/18 105/19 118/8 127/2 128/5 142/19 sample [10] 63/22 64/5 64/8 64/10 67/4 83/11 83/12 83/13 108/8 108/17 sample's [1] 83/25 samples [4] 27/21 56/24 63/19 66/3 sampling [1] 56/12 SANDS [1] 1/25 satellite [1] 23/1 satisfactory [1] 133/2 satisfied [2] 120/5 144/6

saw [62] 8/6 8/7 15/7 15/8 15/10 30/7 40/20 45/5 68/12 72/19 72/24 73/3 73/5 73/7 73/9 73/13 73/16 74/2 75/9 75/10 75/17 75/22 76/5 76/6 76/7 77/22 80/3 81/1 81/8 81/21 82/2 82/2 82/3 82/4 86/5 86/16 86/25 89/19 89/23 90/6 90/7 96/4 96/5 102/12 102/14 102/14 102/15 102/19 102/22 102/23 102/24 103/3 103/7 103/7 103/8 103/9 103/13 104/10 104/16 110/3 114/20 133/18 say [33] 7/5 8/15 9/21 10/15 21/23 22/7 22/8 24/9 26/16 57/19 59/20 67/6 70/6 70/9 71/17 72/12 72/15 74/18 75/24 83/21 84/21 86/23 91/22 92/5 93/14 105/11 112/15 113/18 115/7 121/2 128/13 132/7 145/18 saying [12] 14/5 15/7 32/16 32/17 74/5 74/19 87/19 96/10 100/16 139/17 145/20 says [34] 7/3 9/12 11/13 11/18 11/20 12/7 19/1 37/1 37/5 37/20 38/14 39/9 39/13 39/13 39/20 39/23 61/17 67/4 74/20 75/8 76/4 76/4 77/19 82/13 95/22 96/22 99/10 105/3 105/4 105/25 119/2 134/18 137/10 143/8 scale [1] 102/5 scales [2] 102/3 115/12 scenarios [1] 71/6 scene [29] 22/14 22/14 24/2 31/10 32/13 33/3 34/8 34/16 34/19 34/20 38/12 38/21 38/24 38/25 39/1 39/5 39/6 40/23 42/10 42/12 42/23 42/23 42/25 43/17 43/18 87/15 100/13 115/19 121/18 scenes [7] 21/18 21/20 31/1 31/4 31/5 31/6 science [4] 32/11 53/5 53/5 61/14 Sciences [1] 53/23 scientific [3] 18/17 18/19 19/5 se |1| 91/20 seams [1] 86/12 seat [1] 76/10 seated [7] 20/13 20/25 51/12 70/5 95/4 114/2 147/4 second [35] 4/5 6/10 6/11 9/10 11/8 11/9 11/13 14/8 14/14 15/6 16/23 17/23 60/14 60/17 74/22 82/6 96/11 98/8 104/2 104/11 104/17 115/21 116/4 119/14 120/13 122/16 129/20 135/21 135/23 136/8 137/1 137/2 137/4 138/2 146/2 sccond clause [1] 11/9 seconds [3] 87/3 87/4 87/20 section [15] 12/17 16/25 77/5 77/17 77/19 78/3 92/22 92/22 96/14 96/15 96/16 96/21 118/21 136/2 144/1 Section 1983 [1] 118/21 sections [1] 92/14 secured [2] 119/9 119/17 see [51] 4/21 11/22 12/2 15/11 32/18 32/25 36/3 36/12 37/2 39/14 40/24 47/24 47/24 64/24 70/16 71/15 72/21 73/6 73/22 74/6 74/12 75/12 75/18 75/20 76/9 78/12 81/17 85/25 87/3 87/11 89/5 89/6 91/17 92/14 92/20 94/5 101/5 106/20 108/13 111/21 117/18 129/23 130/2 132/25 134/16 136/4 140/6 140/17 141/21 142/11 143/20 seeing [5] 76/13 89/19 109/24 112/3 143/1 seek |2| 16/1 16/6 seeking [9] 4/17 6/25 7/2 15/23 16/2 126/3 126/16 126/18 126/20 seem [4] 81/1 97/12 97/20 140/9 seemed |1| 143/21

seems |1| 71/2

sees [2] 76/18 85/11

selection [1] 93/19

selling [1] 80/1

seen [3] 15/17 78/15 114/24

Sena 1331 20/21 20/23 21/2 21/3 21/6 23/14 23/22 23/25 24/10 28/7 28/14 30/21 32/21 36/19 39/12 40/14 41/4 43/9 43/14 44/3 44/11 45/21 47/11 48/23 49/14 49/22 50/10 50/25 98/21 103/16 107/23 112/10 148/4 send [17] 17/1 27/23 92/25 93/3 93/5 93/8 93/12 114/10 114/12 116/25 117/1 131/1 133/17 141/12 141/14 146/4 146/5 sending [1] 17/17 sense [27] 76/14 76/17 76/20 76/21 76/24 81/7 84/11 85/1 85/4 85/14 85/15 85/15 85/16 85/18 85/25 90/8 90/13 99/21 99/22 99/22 99/24 100/1 100/9 100/12 100/25 113/13 126/22 sensitive [1] 61/3 sensitivity [7] 56/23 63/18 63/20 65/9 67/7 83/24 111/10 sent |1| 116/23 sentence [7] 6/20 9/17 10/15 11/12 11/13 17/25 18/3 separate [2] 126/24 127/1 serial [1] 96/24 serious [4] 43/8 43/11 57/2 79/9 seriously [3] 70/17 80/12 92/23 serve [1] 127/14 session [1] 3/4 set [2] 15/5 54/4 seven [2] 22/7 52/22 several [4] 36/19 43/19 44/13 89/9 sexual [1] 52/16 shakes [1] 47/7 shall [4] 119/10 130/20 130/21 144/20 she [9] 15/25 19/8 55/20 62/12 62/14 62/14 62/16 108/6 118/1 she's [3] 18/24 19/11 62/16 sheet [10] 12/16 17/23 90/19 91/6 91/16 101/15 101/16 101/17 105/14 116/21 shell [1] 46/16 shield [1] 6/5 shift [1] 43/2 shootings [1] 21/19 short [1] 67/19 shortly [1] 82/6 shot [1] 85/10 should [23] 4/15 4/19 6/20 17/1 18/4 45/8 68/19 69/6 69/23 82/22 101/20 114/11 114/17 115/2 120/4 126/11 126/12 127/11 132/7 133/14 139/17 141/11 145/18 should'vc [1] 86/4 shouldn't [4] 17/25 18/3 115/1 139/17 show [8] 25/14 35/8 73/25 83/22 96/18 107/11 113/18 122/2 showed |2| 99/6 111/17 showing [5] 23/19 62/1 92/19 106/4 122/9 shown [3] 96/2 120/7 120/12 shows [3] 13/12 16/9 101/20 shut [2] 86/4 92/3 side [8] 32/16 32/17 71/13 81/25 113/6 129/23 130/2 130/4 sides | 1 | 132/8 sidewalk [1] 80/6 sight [1] 85/10 sign [2] 18/6 59/16 signature [2] 35/17 35/18 signed [2] 56/7 57/11 significance [1] 99/1 signing [1] 57/12 similar [3] 58/7 127/15 129/14 simple [2] 101/2 101/3 simplify [1] 14/12 simply [5] 12/24 59/15 70/23 91/19 109/23 since [3] 57/25 144/3 145/20 single [2] 49/4 96/1

Case: 12-2479 Document: 40-1 Page: 47 09/27/2012 731928 126

A1241

spent [5] 96/13 99/19 113/1 126/15 126/20 stuff [1] 147/12 S subject [4] 11/19 36/2 53/18 119/6 spite [1] 127/25 sir [7] 30/16 34/11 35/9 51/7 73/25 74/10 split [2] 87/3 87/20 subjects [1] 119/6 79/22 spoke [3] 40/19 68/24 105/7 submit [8] 68/5 68/17 69/5 69/24 101/19 sit [2] 109/1 147/2 102/22 103/21 144/21 spot [1] 87/12 sitting [4] 76/10 83/13 83/25 118/24 St. [1] 53/20 submitted [4] 59/25 60/2 60/23 65/13 situation [2] 100/19 141/5 St. John's [1] 53/20 subsequently [1] 142/11 six [6] 4/25 24/5 26/16 26/22 78/18 83/8 stamp [2] 24/11 37/25 substance [1] 13/7 size [2] 27/8 27/9 stand [8] 19/8 46/9 67/12 84/17 111/17 substantial [2] 125/16 139/22 skin []] 27/16 117/17 145/4 146/9 substantive [1] 122/10 skipped [4] 97/11 97/15 97/18 99/12 standard [6] 56/19 56/24 101/22 101/24 subterfuge [1] 110/1 sleep [1] 88/4 102/1 111/9 subtle [1] 110/23 slightly [2] 76/15 102/5 such [11] 4/3 10/17 13/6 21/18 21/20 58/1 standing [7] 80/3 80/5 81/9 84/16 97/17 slip [1] 12/16 97/22 112/2 75/7 114/18 118/12 126/22 127/19 small [2] 27/9 50/15 stands [4] 12/8 128/17 144/9 145/2 sudden [4] 72/13 72/16 80/4 89/23 smaller [1] 134/11 star [1] 88/23 suffer [2] 126/14 130/20 smallness [1] 50/11 start [11] 37/12 70/13 71/22 86/2 95/8 95/15 suffered [3] 125/20 126/11 126/13 Smith [10] 23/13 26/7 51/9 51/14 51/18 sufficient [6] 5/15 63/17 68/7 110/10 123/16 100/2 138/6 145/7 145/8 146/2 55/18 55/23 58/3 58/18 148/8 started [8] 33/14 37/19 61/3 61/3 76/2 89/25 126/5 so [108] 5/20 6/4 8/8 13/8 13/25 14/18 15/13 91/2 95/19 sufficiently [1] 10/1 15/16 17/5 26/20 27/5 27/9 27/20 29/2 31/17 | starting |2| 61/2 107/23 suggest [3] 9/1 49/21 91/1 suggested [4] 11/3 11/12 139/4 140/16 32/11 33/13 33/14 33/16 34/2 34/17 35/19 starts [5] 8/22 33/12 37/11 37/13 78/12 37/13 37/18 38/1 39/1 40/8 40/10 40/21 state [14] 20/25 41/2 51/12 54/4 116/2 119/1 suggests [1] 13/11 41/13 41/16 42/23 43/2 43/3 43/4 47/20 52/4 119/2 119/4 119/5 119/16 120/2 120/3 suing [3] 5/24 29/3 32/23 52/15 54/2 54/4 56/10 57/1 58/9 58/10 59/9 122/19 124/13 Suite [1] 1/16 59/19 60/19 62/23 63/24 65/17 67/3 70/8 stated [1] 14/4 summarize [1] 3/23 70/18 71/15 72/12 72/13 72/17 72/22 74/9 statement [18] 11/17 36/1 36/6 73/16 73/21 summation [6] 16/13 16/19 95/17 96/19 74/9 74/11 75/1 75/3 95/5 101/3 105/5 75/20 76/15 76/16 76/21 78/2 78/12 80/1 104/4 108/15 80/11 80/25 81/1 84/9 85/20 86/18 87/12 109/11 111/18 111/24 122/24 142/5 144/24 summations [3] 67/19 70/6 101/15 88/22 89/1 91/18 98/16 102/7 104/19 106/22 statements [8] 12/3 16/17 42/2 73/14 85/23 summer [1] 87/24 107/14 108/19 109/20 110/1 111/20 112/15 112/25 115/19 122/18 super [2] 25/11 25/12 114/8 114/10 116/3 118/21 120/4 120/22 states [13] 1/1 1/5 1/11 3/2 5/5 12/3 14/9 supervise [2] 52/4 54/13 122/2 122/14 124/22 127/13 127/17 132/13 53/15 61/15 118/21 119/7 119/18 138/11 supervised [1] 56/4 139/25 141/5 141/10 143/4 143/9 143/10 station [2] 100/20 120/13 supervisor [4] 52/4 59/15 59/16 82/21 143/11 144/5 145/7 145/11 statistics [1] 53/13 supplied [1] 121/17 so-called [1] 118/21 statute [3] 119/2 119/3 119/13 support |3| 3/10 3/19 12/21 some [39] 8/12 13/11 16/12 18/4 18/15 18/18 staying [1] 110/18 supported [1] 14/16 18/19 20/16 25/11 27/16 36/22 47/8 57/22 stem [1] 46/19 supports [1] 12/14 71/5 71/21 72/9 72/18 73/14 88/18 91/22 stenography [1] 2/5 supposed [6] 34/7 34/10 39/6 47/19 74/24 92/5 92/11 95/14 95/16 97/11 112/10 112/17 step [3] 3/12 3/16 71/10 114/10 118/5 118/16 130/19 137/10 138/19 stepped [1] 79/23 supposedly [1] 81/8 138/24 140/8 140/14 140/14 140/18 143/19 steps [2] 41/13 123/16 Supreme [5] 5/5 14/9 52/17 55/14 143/22 somebody [7] 32/18 72/1 72/2 85/11 104/7 stick [1] 132/16 sure [20] 11/3 31/19 32/2 34/10 34/12 40/20 115/7 115/8 still [11] 12/4 12/4 63/21 80/7 83/25 91/7 40/21 46/11 47/14 54/7 65/10 76/6 84/23 somebody's [5] 71/14 71/15 80/10 83/6 87/21 90/14 92/5 133/4 137/5 142/16 145/10 92/5 106/15 108/17 111/1 137/22 101/25 Stolberg [1] 136/4 surface [1] 27/8 someone [2] 49/15 58/3 stood [2] 97/5 144/22 surfaces [1] 107/25 something [19] 9/17 15/10 15/17 31/19 stop [14] 5/14 8/16 8/20 10/5 10/9 10/17 surprise [1] 57/20 57/17 58/9 72/11 72/15 75/6 81/1 81/17 82/3 10/22 10/23 80/16 80/17 80/23 120/19 surrounding [2] 10/23 120/21 93/14 98/20 111/23 111/25 115/8 117/5 120/21 131/1 suspicious [2] 80/20 81/2 sustained [8] 43/25 44/5 44/9 48/9 50/2 stop-and-frisk [1] 80/16 sometimes [1] 57/21 stops [1] 81/11 119/20 125/12 125/25 somewhat [1] 89/16 swab [13] 27/21 38/25 44/17 46/20 47/16 storage [1] 56/7 somewhere [2] 21/23 24/9 stores [1] 89/9 50/23 64/19 64/20 64/20 64/21 65/7 83/6 sorry [10] 8/24 9/11 19/15 34/11 41/1 48/11 stories [7] 73/7 79/16 80/10 81/5 81/6 84/3 83/7 61/21 81/23 81/25 129/10 91/14 swabbed [17] 27/23 44/10 44/13 44/15 sort [5] 18/19 22/11 56/25 58/6 110/1 story [26] 76/15 76/15 76/24 78/2 79/10 44/15 44/19 44/21 44/23 44/24 45/6 46/6 sound [8] 80/2 84/25 96/7 96/8 96/9 102/15 79/17 79/18 79/19 80/11 84/12 85/15 85/17 46/7 46/9 64/18 64/23 65/12 65/12 102/18 105/22 86/9 86/10 90/7 90/8 99/21 99/21 99/22 swabbing [3] 18/22 30/13 30/18 sounds [1] 84/13 99/23 99/25 100/10 100/11 100/25 101/3 swabs [9] 27/14 40/7 45/25 47/9 56/9 56/11 Southern [2] 53/16 55/16 106/14 56/11 56/13 108/6 speak [14] 19/7 19/9 19/22 19/24 20/1 83/25 strap [4] 27/19 46/7 46/11 64/20 swear [4] 20/22 73/6 130/17 130/18 92/24 104/19 105/16 109/1 130/20 130/21 street [15] 1/23 76/8 76/20 84/20 88/6 88/9 swearing [1] 86/5 132/12 141/8 89/9 90/11 91/13 97/16 97/19 100/3 101/5 sweat |1| 46/25 special [5] 31/9 34/6 69/24 82/13 118/14 110/16 110/19 sworn |4| 20/23 51/10 86/25 130/19 specialized [1] 32/8 streetlights [1] 97/21 sympathy [1] 128/23 specifie [11] 30/10 30/12 30/19 30/20 38/3 stricken [1] 117/5 system [2] 79/8 93/15 55/1 72/18 96/13 97/7 97/13 114/12 strictly [1] 10/11 specifically [7] 16/6 38/23 59/20 61/14 68/9 strike [7] 19/3 71/24 71/25 71/25 72/2 93/10 102/12 136/19 tactic [1] 97/23 138/22 specifies [1] 96/24 structure [2] 25/9 25/10 taint |1| 92/16 Speedy [1] 4/20 take |30| 6/6 19/12 21/21 24/18 24/21 31/19 stuck [1] 85/18

student [1] 14/11

43/5 46/2 46/25 47/9 49/24 67/21 70/16

spell [2] 20/25 51/12

A1242

text |1| 12/14 91/14 92/17 92/19 93/1 93/6 93/20 101/6 101/20 106/22 107/11 110/3 110/13 110/15 texture [2] 26/5 26/7 take... [17] 71/10 71/20 83/7 84/16 84/24 than |12| 5/19 24/21 56/24 103/3 112/7 112/22 113/17 116/7 118/17 120/18 121/15 85/9 87/9 92/23 93/24 93/25 104/16 111/20 114/15 115/11 125/13 128/4 136/22 138/10 124/12 128/24 135/9 142/25 113/22 114/6 135/7 135/9 136/16 they [187] taken [7] 53/11 94/6 100/20 103/11 113/10 thank [28] 3/20 28/11 30/17 40/12 41/1 51/4 they'll [1] 34/4 they're [17] 12/4 23/25 27/9 34/7 69/25 70/7 121/3 145/18 51/7 58/13 65/21 66/11 67/10 67/11 69/21 takes [6] 3/5 19/8 95/2 123/16 135/10 147/1 85/18 88/21 91/18 91/19 91/21 102/24 70/11 70/12 70/18 93/22 93/23 95/12 109/6 taking [7] 56/10 56/11 56/12 80/11 83/5 109/8 109/9 109/10 113/22 130/24 132/9 110/14 110/19 135/12 136/13 144/6 83/6 120/12 132/10 145/3 they've [5] 15/11 15/17 24/25 86/25 114/9 tałk [11] 20/10 71/16 79/22 82/6 102/7 thanking [1] 95/8 thing [33] 5/13 9/8 12/10 16/23 17/22 18/10 104/11 105/16 107/14 110/2 112/20 132/14 thanks [2] 51/19 70/14 75/8 75/8 76/4 80/4 81/3 81/13 81/21 82/2 talked [6] 89/1 91/2 98/1 98/12 107/16 that [881] 82/2 82/7 82/23 82/25 85/4 87/22 88/12 89/4 that's [118] 4/24 5/11 5/15 5/25 6/5 7/8 8/17 91/2 91/21 105/18 105/20 112/17 112/20 talking [10] 17/11 17/12 73/19 91/18 99/20 11/18 12/7 12/7 14/20 15/1 16/2 16/8 17/19 113/20 113/21 140/16 145/20 146/2 100/2 109/21 125/7 137/19 142/19 20/8 22/4 23/4 24/13 24/17 24/25 29/5 30/6 thing's [1] 88/11 things [15] 60/11 70/22 72/9 72/18 73/10 talks [1] 138/13 31/3 31/7 31/24 34/18 37/19 37/20 38/14 team [16] 21/13 21/14 21/17 22/17 23/5 74/19 75/6 75/25 84/4 101/1 108/15 109/16 38/21 39/5 39/18 40/10 41/21 42/17 43/11 26/13 30/22 32/9 33/17 33/19 33/21 33/24 46/18 49/7 49/13 50/24 58/22 59/1 61/8 110/2 110/3 119/12 34/14 35/12 42/13 98/22 61/18 61/18 61/23 72/17 74/15 74/15 75/1 think [55] 4/3 5/15 5/18 5/25 8/11 9/21 9/25 technique [1] 18/18 75/10 75/11 75/22 76/14 77/7 77/9 78/6 78/9 12/14 13/14 14/25 15/1 15/16 15/16 15/18 techniques [1] 53/10 79/24 80/18 81/19 84/8 84/16 85/10 85/18 17/8 17/8 18/7 20/6 50/6 50/11 59/8 73/13 technology [2] 52/24 61/8 86/24 87/5 87/5 87/6 89/6 91/9 91/14 93/14 75/6 76/9 80/5 80/6 84/12 84/12 85/16 85/22 Telephone [1] 2/2 93/16 93/20 96/9 96/25 96/25 97/1 97/23 86/3 89/22 90/6 90/15 91/10 92/4 92/4 98/18 tell [41] 20/9 21/8 38/18 40/22 41/13 41/24 98/25 99/11 100/10 100/16 100/22 100/24 98/19 99/13 100/12 108/24 109/20 110/9 42/7 42/8 46/5 48/20 53/3 53/24 60/13 73/8 100/25 101/7 101/7 101/8 102/19 102/20 112/8 117/8 117/10 118/12 130/6 131/5 73/21 73/22 74/12 75/21 77/24 80/13 81/6 104/10 104/12 105/23 105/25 107/19 108/9 133/14 139/3 143/11 144/15 145/1 81/14 81/20 86/15 93/13 99/21 102/13 108/22 109/17 109/20 110/2 111/2 111/20 thinking [5] 6/22 15/6 15/10 76/22 125/3 104/22 107/2 109/2 110/21 111/19 113/16 120/17 120/20 120/20 125/13 133/10 134/15 thinks [4] 93/7 93/9 93/13 99/20 114/4 118/17 128/17 130/25 132/18 138/24 137/8 137/19 138/11 139/8 140/12 141/11 third [12] 4/15 9/11 60/17 71/14 102/16 106/25 115/25 116/5 119/16 120/15 124/18 144/11 144/20 144/5 telling [12] 71/14 71/18 75/14 76/25 78/12 their [32] 5/25 6/1 8/4 8/11 16/19 27/8 53/9 125/10 79/4 79/20 81/13 81/14 100/16 117/15 140/9 55/3 56/12 58/4 68/4 68/6 69/17 81/4 81/5 Thirteen [1] 22/20 tells [5] 74/22 74/23 75/9 75/9 100/5 83/20 84/11 85/15 85/17 87/6 90/2 92/13 this [341] ten [2] 19/14 67/21 those [20] 6/10 26/25 27/20 54/5 65/18 73/7 99/16 103/9 104/5 117/17 118/12 119/1 ten-minute [1] 67/21 120/24 126/8 142/10 144/12 73/10 78/2 78/20 83/9 87/10 91/1 92/8 92/11 tends [1] 122/7 them [41] 8/7 10/6 15/14 27/23 44/21 47/16 114/3 114/5 116/23 126/11 129/15 134/14 49/16 61/16 66/7 66/18 71/6 74/12 81/7 82/3 though [1] 33/2 tent [1] 25/8 tent-like [1] 25/8 87/9 87/13 100/19 108/7 108/11 110/16 thought [5] 15/8 30/3 42/17 59/11 138/23 term |1| 89/24 110/17 114/3 116/11 116/25 117/4 118/16 thousand [1] 89/13 terminated [1] 123/3 124/25 127/23 128/3 130/21 130/21 132/12 thousands [4] 54/14 55/7 59/19 89/12 terms [3] 63/8 110/7 110/12 132/13 132/15 132/16 132/18 136/6 138/24 three [14] 6/24 27/18 52/5 74/24 87/4 90/22 territory [1] 119/4 142/13 143/1 145/4 101/1 101/4 102/9 106/15 115/17 121/15 test [33] 25/5 25/15 25/23 26/25 27/5 27/21 123/4 125/24 themselves [2] 13/1 56/12 30/2 34/20 47/16 47/16 47/18 47/19 49/9 then [66] 3/24 5/13 6/22 7/3 7/5 7/7 7/11 threw [11] 32/16 32/25 44/8 79/25 80/8 49/12 50/18 50/20 55/2 64/1 64/13 65/2 10/6 11/12 13/10 14/1 18/4 18/8 19/3 19/19 87/12 87/23 89/5 89/6 103/2 104/7 65/18 66/2 66/7 83/8 83/15 83/24 108/7 49/11 55/2 56/12 66/24 66/25 70/25 72/15 through [19] 10/10 52/5 70/24 75/5 76/22 108/11 108/16 108/18 112/14 112/14 112/16 73/10 73/25 74/7 74/10 77/19 78/11 79/23 76/23 85/17 85/22 90/19 90/21 91/10 93/5 tested [13] 26/12 27/17 34/17 49/4 64/5 64/8 80/4 83/10 85/25 86/2 91/5 91/8 91/15 91/17 93/18 95/15 95/24 117/2 122/17 128/7 132/2 64/11 64/12 83/4 83/12 108/7 110/22 111/7 93/24 97/18 102/5 102/15 105/8 107/8 throughout [6] 9/16 58/25 85/14 95/9 96/10 testified [29] 20/24 26/22 30/21 31/3 48/10 109/14 115/12 118/18 120/6 121/13 121/15 48/12 48/23 49/7 49/11 50/3 50/8 50/9 50/20 124/7 124/14 124/16 125/4 127/6 127/8 throw [13] 32/17 32/18 68/12 68/16 69/15 51/10 52/15 52/18 61/6 63/11 68/9 68/11 128/8 129/18 129/20 129/22 135/2 135/3 76/18 81/23 84/24 91/9 102/22 102/24 68/14 68/23 79/20 80/12 106/13 109/18 139/22 140/15 141/4 141/11 141/14 104/17 112/3 109/19 117/18 117/25 theoretical [1] 141/2 throwing [5] 68/11 76/20 83/7 99/11 109/24 testify [9] 15/11 19/19 28/18 28/21 52/7 theoretically [1] 140/2 thrown [2] 86/7 87/5 58/20 58/23 58/25 79/9 theory [1] 18/18 time [76] 4/12 5/18 5/18 7/22 7/23 7/23 18/5 testifying [2] 79/1 89/3 19/3 23/14 24/17 33/8 37/1 37/4 37/6 37/22 there [162] testimony [50] 4/3 4/10 8/9 8/11 10/16 10/17 there's [57] 9/16 11/25 15/9 18/10 32/15 37/25 38/3 38/11 38/18 38/19 38/21 39/5 11/18 12/18 12/20 12/21 13/7 14/23 14/24 34/3 39/20 47/24 64/22 68/7 68/20 69/20 39/9 42/24 42/24 49/4 55/17 56/5 57/1 58/14 31/12 50/7 60/19 67/2 68/6 68/25 68/25 69/5 71/6 71/8 71/13 72/22 76/5 76/16 77/5 78/20 58/20 59/17 67/14 68/15 70/15 74/25 75/7 69/15 71/21 72/1 72/2 72/5 73/11 81/5 90/2 79/4 81/7 82/13 82/25 83/8 84/10 86/11 77/25 78/17 81/6 82/15 84/15 84/15 84/21 95/23 96/10 97/2 97/3 97/7 97/10 98/14 84/23 86/20 88/10 89/14 96/1 96/13 96/22 91/17 91/23 92/22 98/25 99/24 102/18 99/14 99/16 102/8 103/3 103/4 105/8 105/9 104/15 104/17 105/11 105/22 106/2 106/6 97/14 99/20 102/17 109/6 111/1 111/2 111/4 117/21 117/22 117/23 118/3 118/5 122/25 106/7 106/8 106/9 107/13 108/21 111/15 112/12 112/13 113/9 113/11 118/8 120/23 145/24 121/5 123/8 131/16 131/20 133/13 136/10 120/24 121/3 122/5 122/6 123/15 126/20 testing [37] 18/18 22/11 25/6 25/7 27/7 28/4 136/22 137/9 139/13 139/13 142/12 143/8 127/2 136/20 136/21 139/22 140/12 144/1 48/24 49/1 50/16 53/17 54/4 54/15 54/20 times [23] 15/11 21/24 22/6 22/8 22/10 Therefore [1] 140/25 56/13 56/19 56/23 56/23 56/25 57/1 59/14 26/15 26/15 52/11 52/13 55/5 55/7 55/11 thereof [1] 84/6 59/17 59/19 60/24 60/25 61/4 63/7 63/14 55/12 60/12 70/21 72/3 72/8 72/10 72/14 these [50] 5/24 22/7 30/14 36/22 38/22 39/4 63/18 63/20 65/8 65/9 65/13 67/7 98/16 74/24 82/14 115/20 125/7 39/13 54/16 57/4 70/3 73/11 74/19 75/6 111/10 112/11 112/11 75/25 77/21 78/13 78/13 78/15 81/4 81/19 timing [1] 104/18 tests [3] 25/21 52/6 56/20 83/19 83/21 84/3 86/13 88/2 90/23 91/11 tips [1] 102/5

Case: 12-2479 Document: 40-1 Page: 49 09/27/2012 731928 126

A1243

103/24 107/15 110/16 120/18 123/3 127/1 verbatim |1| 72/6 T verdict [26] 17/1 17/23 18/1 18/4 18/5 69/23 134/11 143/5 144/12 title [2] 21/8 118/21 90/18 91/6 91/16 93/6 101/15 101/16 101/17 two weeks [1] 63/3 today [11] 59/4 59/25 63/22 65/12 91/3 two-dollar [1] 143/5 105/14 114/19 116/21 128/15 128/16 128/18 107/22 109/19 111/2 111/5 112/12 143/2 type [5] 23/12 24/6 56/23 82/10 126/7 128/20 128/21 128/22 130/22 132/12 135/25 146/7 today's [1] 131/5 typed [1] 18/8 together [16] 70/24 75/4 78/7 83/20 85/20 version [4] 77/4 81/10 81/11 134/12 types [2] 52/14 56/20 85/23 85/23 85/24 86/1 116/24 117/7 121/21 typically [2] 57/17 57/19 versus [1] 1/4 130/19 132/6 143/11 144/25 very [25] 3/20 8/21 14/19 15/17 16/13 43/8 told [49] 42/2 72/18 74/1 74/6 74/7 74/8 47/19 50/4 50/8 50/15 51/7 57/2 67/3 67/11 UF [1] 99/6 74/25 75/3 76/1 79/16 81/20 82/21 83/23 70/17 77/10 77/11 82/25 90/19 91/2 92/23 84/17 87/18 95/24 98/22 100/4 100/4 100/18 UF-250 [1] 99/6 108/1 109/8 111/15 114/15 view [7] 10/2 91/19 114/16 114/18 115/1 101/2 102/10 102/12 102/16 103/6 103/7 unanimously [1] 116/19 103/8 103/13 103/16 105/7 105/17 105/18 uncharted [3] 144/15 144/17 144/25 115/3 117/11 105/20 106/6 106/13 106/17 107/23 108/6 unclear [1] 73/2 violate [3] 129/8 129/12 130/12 109/3 111/13 111/25 112/1 112/15 112/25 under [30] 7/7 7/9 11/8 12/5 13/14 42/22 violated [4] 115/25 129/18 136/20 136/23 125/4 125/5 142/3 142/13 145/4 72/10 73/6 75/16 75/21 76/3 79/1 79/9 79/20 violates [1] 124/22 tomorrow [8] 145/7 145/8 146/3 146/4 146/7 80/13 86/5 86/25 98/7 118/20 119/2 119/3 violation [7] 120/9 120/20 123/17 136/12 119/13 119/15 120/3 120/25 122/13 122/15 147/5 147/8 147/16 139/20 139/21 140/14 tonight [2] 146/3 147/8 129/14 130/14 141/3 violent |1| 31/5 too |5| 70/2 76/5 87/3 87/4 89/24 underlying [1] 59/1 vision [1] 80/3 took [9] 23/14 23/23 24/10 41/13 48/20 56/7 understand [24] 5/8 65/10 70/17 70/21 86/2 voice [1] 92/24 87/10 87/15 87/22 86/23 91/19 92/21 112/4 113/4 116/10 125/8 VOLUME [1] 1/9 top [5] 25/9 25/12 38/11 39/12 39/12 136/17 139/10 139/14 139/14 139/17 139/23 voluntarily [2] 106/13 119/22 tort [1] 138/7 140/4 140/19 140/23 142/9 142/10 142/25 vote |2| 128/14 128/17 toss [6] 76/6 77/23 83/6 105/22 106/21 understanding [5] 11/4 23/4 47/18 80/12 voucher [4] 45/2 45/5 45/25 46/3 108/13 143/2 vouchering [1] 45/25 tossed [4] 90/14 96/6 99/3 102/13 undisputed [1] 89/4 tosses [1] 90/9 unimportant [1] 89/2 tossing [2] 85/3 101/7 unit [7] 21/11 30/22 30/25 37/11 74/11 waist [4] 75/10 75/13 77/7 81/25 touch [2] 49/15 92/15 74/23 101/4 waistband [7] 58/4 68/11 96/5 101/6 102/11 UNITED [10] 1/1 1/5 1/11 3/2 5/4 14/9 touched [2] 27/15 85/5 104/16 105/21 53/15 118/21 119/6 119/18 tour [9] 33/12 33/14 33/23 33/25 37/11 wait [5] 44/2 83/18 84/17 84/20 85/1 37/12 37/13 37/13 37/19 units [1] 43/19 waiting [1] 34/13 University [1] 53/5 walk |3| 70/23 90/11 90/19 Toward [1] 39/16 towards [3] 76/12 106/7 124/5 unless |2| 116/10 130/21 walked [1] 37/17 walking [4] 81/11 84/18 100/3 101/5 unlikely [3] 26/3 50/4 50/8 TPO [1] 96/22 unmistakable [1] 96/8 trained |2| 55/3 81/19 wall [1] 87/5 training [13] 22/11 22/15 22/15 31/9 31/14 unrefuted [1] 106/1 want [62] 5/23 8/19 8/20 9/7 10/25 11/1 32/2 32/6 47/11 53/7 53/8 54/21 54/24 54/25 until [14] 7/22 29/4 33/5 43/4 59/7 83/18 17/4 19/4 19/15 19/17 20/10 31/19 31/23 84/20 85/1 128/17 130/25 132/2 146/3 147/9 transcript [4] 1/10 2/5 5/16 114/11 31/25 36/9 36/10 39/11 46/21 55/21 62/5 Transcription [1] 2/5 62/6 67/19 70/13 70/18 78/19 79/8 82/7 transcripts [2] 114/9 114/10 unusual [3] 25/21 42/11 42/15 83/22 84/7 84/10 84/12 85/22 88/12 88/13 transpired [1] 36/22 up [33] 6/24 18/8 25/11 34/4 41/24 44/2 92/4 92/15 92/15 92/16 92/23 93/24 95/8 46/9 46/25 47/1 68/15 72/13 76/11 78/1 treasure [1] 127/23 95/14 95/15 109/3 109/14 112/20 114/12 treatment [2] 16/2 16/6 80/10 84/2 84/6 84/13 84/22 85/17 88/24 116/24 131/1 132/14 132/15 139/3 141/10 trial [26] 1/10 3/6 3/11 3/20 4/20 5/4 60/7 92/2 93/23 102/17 104/20 110/17 113/9 141/12 141/13 141/21 142/14 145/7 146/3 69/1 82/8 82/8 83/19 85/14 86/12 88/18 115/22 120/24 121/6 131/25 132/5 132/13 146/4 147/6 147/7 90/24 95/10 106/9 107/1 114/12 116/1 116/6 143/25 wanted [7] 10/4 17/5 82/24 82/25 95/20 117/4 124/19 129/9 129/13 130/13 upon [8] 8/13 72/3 100/13 115/21 [27/7 136/15 144/2 127/21 130/22 144/19 trials [1] 127/1 wanting [1] 104/6 tried [3] 85/13 97/6 114/16 us [17] 38/25 39/1 42/2 45/16 53/3 53/24 wantonly [1] 127/18 trigger [5] 27/18 27/18 44/19 46/12 64/20 54/7 56/18 70/15 70/18 72/19 92/10 101/16 wants [12] 90/14 96/11 96/14 98/17 98/19 trouble [1] 20/16 103/16 111/1 112/15 142/6 99/13 100/12 102/21 108/9 108/23 108/23 true [11] 6/22 15/6 73/7 75/1 76/23 76/24 usage [1] 119/4 145/3 105/25 115/11 115/11 118/2 125/3 use [13] 16/25 25/9 25/10 27/15 32/11 37/23 warning [1] 127/14 truly [1] 111/6 38/1 53/10 76/21 85/25 101/16 113/12 warns [1] 100/6 truth [14] 71/14 71/18 73/12 76/2 79/5 126/22 warrant [1] 127/18 80/13 81/16 81/16 87/2 87/2 87/18 87/18 used [3] 25/4 42/7 61/15 was 12631 using [7] 10/10 12/21 76/22 82/17 82/17 wasn't [14] 37/16 59/6 71/8 74/22 74/23 112/7 117/15 trv [7] 5/9 70/7 83/20 109/3 114/11 118/9 89/25 97/6 74/23 74/24 80/5 83/1 83/11 83/25 102/25 142/18 usually [4] 30/25 34/4 54/6 57/2 111/11 117/6 trying [10] 27/4 41/10 76/17 80/2 81/8 81/10 waste [1] 19/3 85/7 85/8 95/19 127/1 water |1| 83/16 valid [1] 145/2 turn [6] 5/20 6/8 22/21 25/5 91/1 109/14 waters |2| 144/15 144/25 turned [4] 12/24 66/18 67/2 112/1 validity [5] 4/6 5/9 8/5 8/13 8/19 wavering [1] 15/9 turning [5] 85/6 85/7 85/9 85/12 130/8 value [1] 92/18 way |21| 12/11 15/25 16/8 19/18 24/17 twist [1] 76/17 vantage [1] 102/14 32/12 38/24 58/6 70/16 70/25 71/15 75/24 various [1] 115/19 twists [1] 76/16 79/4 79/7 85/19 86/11 89/8 89/8 117/18 two [37] 26/14 39/20 53/1 58/10 63/3 66/22 Vassar [1] 53/4 118/8 141/11 69/24 73/7 74/6 79/16 81/6 81/7 81/11 82/14 vast [1] 13/3 ways [2] 13/25 100/4 86/5 87/9 88/12 90/23 91/22 92/6 92/10 veracity |5| 69/20 117/15 118/7 118/9 we [160] 92/11 93/1 93/6 93/20 101/5 101/17 101/20 118/13 we'd [2] 8/17 104/23

09/27/2012 731928

A1244

W we'll [9] 6/6 67/19 82/6 93/25 109/14 110/17 113/23 116/25 145/8 we're [19] 5/13 27/4 42/24 43/1 54/5 67/7 71/22 87/21 88/2 88/17 89/19 93/16 109/20 125/6 137/19 142/22 143/1 144/15 144/25 we've [11] 15/8 67/18 70/3 71/21 78/15 84/9 94/4 98/14 114/15 132/23 135/20 weapon [11] 27/3 27/4 27/5 31/6 43/8 58/8 58/11 98/8 106/16 122/12 122/21 weapons [3] 21/19 52/16 60/22 wearing [1] 48/15 website [10] 19/1 61/13 61/17 62/3 62/13 62/15 62/17 62/18 62/20 62/22 week [11] 29/1 29/4 59/7 59/8 59/8 60/3 60/5 while [4] 84/15 95/17 139/19 140/12 66/19 83/19 88/16 110/25 weeks [1] 63/3 weigh [1] 103/4 weighing [1] 102/3 weight [3] 19/6 117/8 118/12 WEINSTEIN [6] 1/10 3/4 3/5 95/2 101/12 147/1 well [46] 3/17 15/14 17/11 17/19 22/13 25/7 26/9 27/11 33/10 33/12 34/15 34/22 37/13 40/22 53/19 54/12 56/16 61/3 66/22 67/6 68/6 69/4 69/8 73/2 74/5 74/15 78/12 80/9 81/12 86/23 95/11 100/6 100/12 100/22 106/12 108/7 108/17 112/15 118/14 135/24 137/18 138/3 141/25 143/16 144/15 145/17 well-advised [1] 69/8 went [4] 23/7 95/24 103/18 105/9 were [85] 10/10 12/23 15/13 15/14 24/4 24/23 25/15 26/22 27/17 27/25 28/24 29/2 30/8 32/5 43/23 47/8 48/4 48/17 51/1 56/9 56/11 56/14 56/20 57/4 59/3 59/6 59/15 59/17 62/23 63/11 64/17 64/18 64/19 64/25 64/25 65/11 65/12 66/1 70/15 78/1 83/11 85/9 86/23 86/24 87/5 87/6 87/14 87/17 88/3 92/19 95/16 97/3 97/13 97/15 97/19 97/21 100/16 101/5 102/9 103/15 103/18 106/19 108/7 110/9 111/13 111/25 112/1 114/8 115/20 115/21 117/3 118/6 118/10 118/11 119/19 120/3 121/22 123/7 123/8 125/12 127/1 133/16 134/11 136/1 143/6 weren't [8] 33/2 33/5 40/8 79/12 91/12 92/20 108/2 110/3 Wesson [3] 23/13 26/8 55/23 what [235] what the [1] 142/9 what's [24] 11/19 35/8 38/16 42/20 42/21 42/23 56/22 62/14 62/17 75/8 76/4 76/23 76/24 76/25 89/4 89/11 98/16 100/11 104/5 104/5 104/7 108/23 134/21 142/7 whatever [2] 92/18 117/10 whatsoever [1] 41/14 when [81] 9/18 9/21 11/11 15/24 17/5 17/23 18/9 18/16 18/22 21/20 23/14 28/24 28/24 30/2 31/19 31/20 32/5 33/8 34/2 34/7 34/19 37/17 37/19 37/25 41/10 47/18 48/4 48/4 48/10 48/15 48/17 50/25 62/23 73/15 76/2 79/8 79/16 79/17 79/24 80/8 80/12 82/14 83/3 83/19 84/16 85/20 89/17 90/11 91/2 91/17 92/4 97/3 97/4 97/8 97/8 100/12 103/16 103/17 104/18 105/6 108/20 108/24 112/4 112/6 113/12 115/1 118/17 120/3 120/11 120/24 122/1 122/12 123/1 123/14 128/6 128/11 128/15 128/20 136/11 136/19 145/10 whenever [1] 125/15 where [39] 8/1 8/15 8/19 8/20 9/11 11/13 19/10 21/14 22/25 23/4 24/23 24/25 25/13 37/1 38/25 39/13 39/20 43/13 46/9 46/14

52/23 54/20 57/15 71/5 72/12 81/9 82/8 89/9 98/24 108/10 109/25 92/6 97/16 97/17 97/19 97/21 100/7 114/6 133/9 134/1 136/25 143/8 Whereupon [1] 142/21 whether [26] 8/6 73/3 97/8 101/11 101/18 101/25 102/21 103/24 104/13 104/14 111/13 116/3 116/4 116/5 117/22 121/1 121/2 121/23 123/10 123/12 123/23 124/23 132/14 140/25 143/19 144/4 which [41] 4/11 4/13 6/9 7/22 8/13 8/23 11/24 13/6 19/1 21/11 23/1 27/17 46/7 46/13 46/14 53/8 53/12 56/8 56/11 56/24 67/6 80/9 81/12 81/21 85/4 96/22 98/6 105/13 115/20 122/10 122/11 131/4 131/13 131/16 131/20 134/24 135/3 135/4 135/4 136/11 140/10 who [31] 23/8 27/4 32/25 41/2 41/19 41/21 44/8 56/3 57/10 71/18 71/18 73/18 73/18 78/10 87/12 88/7 88/10 88/25 89/5 89/6 99/23 102/9 108/21 109/5 112/16 115/10 118/25 119/3 121/17 127/15 128/8 who's [5] 78/25 88/23 103/4 103/5 117/15 Whoever [1] 112/18 whole [15] 11/25 13/23 32/15 71/2 75/2 76/24 80/4 82/2 88/11 88/24 90/8 101/7 102/17 114/12 126/9 whom [1] 51/22 whose [8] 72/1 99/21 99/22 100/14 100/14 100/17 100/17 103/3 why [57] 6/1 23/3 23/3 26/4 27/2 37/20 73/6 73/8 75/6 75/21 76/14 77/2 77/12 77/19 77/20 77/24 78/20 80/25 81/2 81/12 81/14 81/17 81/20 82/18 82/20 82/20 82/22 83/15 83/20 83/23 83/25 84/20 85/5 85/7 85/15 85/18 86/2 86/7 87/5 87/5 87/6 88/4 88/19 100/7 100/8 101/8 107/23 109/17 111/7 111/11 111/11 111/20 111/24 112/14 113/22 137/7 137/8 will [46] 3/16 5/12 10/6 17/16 19/21 26/10 34/4 39/1 54/6 66/12 70/8 88/9 93/16 93/23 95/13 101/12 102/13 104/22 105/2 106/5 106/7 110/21 113/2 113/16 113/17 113/19 113/19 114/6 114/7 114/17 116/8 116/23 118/18 124/4 126/4 127/25 128/8 128/15 128/19 130/18 132/18 132/18 132/20 145/8 145/10 147/9 wiped [1] 64/4 wiping [1] 58/7 wish [4] 68/4 114/9 129/23 130/2 withdraw |2| 64/17 65/17 Withdrawn [1] 48/11 withholding [1] 122/18 within [6] 42/17 52/17 53/10 59/9 119/8 123/15 without [22] 15/17 18/23 50/12 107/8 117/9 118/4 124/6 125/21 128/20 128/22 128/22 128/23 128/23 135/18 135/19 139/5 140/1 140/3 141/1 141/6 143/17 143/19 witness [45] 12/15 12/17 12/20 13/4 13/4 13/6 13/11 19/8 19/10 19/16 19/19 19/22 19/25 20/1 20/9 20/19 20/22 23/17 23/19 30/16 35/8 37/1 42/2 47/7 51/7 62/12 65/21 67/12 71/25 79/14 88/23 95/21 105/24 111/2 111/8 117/17 117/20 117/23 117/25 118/4 118/9 132/24 132/25 133/3 148/3 witness's [4] 12/18 12/21 117/16 118/3 witnesses [8] 67/13 67/15 83/19 88/18 116/22 118/10 118/14 131/24 won't [5] 15/18 43/3 79/12 129/17 145/11 Woolworth [1] 1/15 word [5] 96/15 96/16 97/25 108/19 109/2 wording [1] 144/1

words [8] 96/25 97/1 97/24 98/11 98/17

work [9] 24/16 33/22 51/23 52/23 52/23 75/5 76/23 93/18 143/18 worked [8] 28/7 52/20 53/9 55/2 78/7 86/19 90/15 90/16 working [1] 43/19 works [2] 100/24 100/25 worried [1] 90/10 would [80] 5/19 7/15 8/15 9/1 9/4 9/15 10/14 10/19 14/12 16/12 16/17 17/21 18/23 20/7 20/8 21/23 22/7 22/8 24/9 26/7 27/10 33/15 36/7 41/3 41/5 41/6 41/17 43/10 43/18 45/5 46/25 47/12 47/14 47/22 49/14 49/21 50/18 54/19 57/19 58/4 58/7 63/19 65/1 65/1 65/2 69/8 70/23 82/18 82/19 83/15 84/20 84/24 85/5 87/8 87/10 87/11 87/18 90/7 90/11 90/12 95/12 100/7 100/8 100/18 100/19 100/19 100/20 107/17 113/10 113/11 122/1 125/21 132/12 132/16 138/20 140/18 141/4 144/7 144/11 144/21 would've [2] 87/22 121/9 wouldn't [12] 43/22 47/5 47/14 82/20 83/16 85/2 86/19 87/18 89/14 111/11 112/17 141/5 wound [1] 113/9 wrestling [1] 143/22 write [5] 38/24 41/19 52/7 78/8 78/9 writing [2] 128/7 128/20 written [3] 12/15 57/4 110/24 wrong [7] 24/13 24/15 88/7 88/11 88/11 89/8 135/21 wrongful [2] 124/2 125/21 wrote 1 57/10

yeah [15] 34/9 36/18 40/20 40/25 41/7 41/23 42/5 46/4 60/14 61/20 84/24 135/2 135/3 142/16 145/5 year [19] 14/11 21/22 21/23 22/4 22/5 26/15 52/25 54/9 72/7 72/7 72/10 72/11 72/14 79/11 81/6 109/18 109/19 109/22 109/22 vears [30] 22/7 22/20 24/25 29/3 30/2 32/5 43/23 52/22 53/1 59/11 61/2 63/24 79/1 79/1 83/14 83/21 88/15 89/1 89/13 90/2 95/25 95/25 99/15 109/17 109/21 111/10 112/13 112/21 112/21 112/24 yes [155] vesterday [13] 4/9 11/3 11/11 11/16 16/15 67/1 71/24 89/21 101/3 102/10 105/6 106/12 106/17 yet [3] 74/21 86/6 89/13 yield [4] 18/21 25/22 65/5 65/8 yielded [2] 60/20 61/12 vo 111 73/15 YORK [20] 1/1 1/5 1/6 1/16 1/16 1/22 1/23 1/23 3/3 3/8 14/8 21/9 52/18 53/16 55/15 83/4 119/5 120/2 122/15 136/11 you [791] you'd [1] 43/9 you'll [20] 5/20 19/19 70/5 85/10 90/20 90/21 91/17 92/8 92/14 109/1 115/3 116/22 116/22 117/1 117/1 127/8 128/22 128/24 129/18 146/7 you're [28] 5/24 14/7 32/8 32/23 41/10 47/19 74/24 85/6 85/8 90/20 92/11 93/19 96/19 101/14 101/16 101/25 109/12 109/12 112/8 114/7 114/14 128/11 130/8 132/13 141/2 145/17 145/21 146/6 you've [17] 26/20 30/14 36/17 46/5 49/5 58/20 70/16 70/20 91/8 101/22 102/3 106/12 114/24 128/18 128/20 140/14 145/19 your [217] yourselves [1] 146/5

A1245

DEFENDANTS' BRIEF, DATED APRIL 25, 2012, READ IN SUPPORT OF MULTIPLE TRIAL MOTIONS (pp. A1245-A1256)

REPRODUCED FOLLOWING

Case: 12-2479 Document: 40-1 Page: 52 09/27/2012 731928 126

A1246

Case 1.10-cv 02714-JBW-VVP | Document 69 | Filed 04/25/12 | Page 1 of 11 PageID #: 1044

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT EASTERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK	x
JOSHUA MARSHALL,	
Plaintiff,	
-against-	
P.O. SALIM RANDALL, Shield No. 15331, Individually and in His Official Capacity, P.O. MICHAEL BURBRIDGE, Shield No. 15488, Individually and in His Official Capacity,	10 Civ. 2714 (JBW)(VVP)
Defendants.	×

DEFENDANTS' BRIEF IN SUPPORT OF MULTIPLE TRIAL MOTIONS

FELICIA GROSS
JOHANA CASTRO
MICHAEL A. CARDOZO
Corporation Counsel of the City of New York
100 Church Street
New York, New York 10007
(212) 788-0303
<u>fgross@law.nyc.gov</u>
<u>jcastro@law.nyc.gov</u>

Attorneys for Defendants

Case: 12-2479 Document: 40-1 Page: 53 09/27/2012 731928 126

A1247

Ten 1.16 - v-02714-JBW-VVP | Document 69 | Filed 0425/12 | Page 2 of 11 PageiD # 1045

PRELIMINARY STATEMENT

Trial commenced in this matter on April 23, 2012 before the Honorable Jack B. Weinstein, United States District Judge. Defendants have made several motions during the course of trial, which the Court has either denied or reserved ruling on pending briefing by defendants.

Defendants respectfully submit this memorandum of law in support of their several motions seeking the following relief: (1) defendants should be permitted to cross-examine plaintiff as to his criminal history now that plaintiff has opened the door to such testimony; (2) plaintiff has improperly made an issue of the legal validity of the officers' initial approach in contravention of the court's prior order; defendants request a curative instruction, and, in the alternative, a mistrial; (3) defendants should be permitted to cross-examine plaintiff as to his emotional and psychological injuries stemming from his incarceration; (4) defendants should be permitted to mention in closing that the criminal case against plaintiff was dismissed on speedy trial grounds; (5) defendants request a curative instruction as to the import of the grand jury's indictment; (6) defendants request a jury instruction that the grand jury indictment creates a presumption of probable cause; and (7) defendants move to dismiss the malicious prosecution and fair trial claims in light of the U.S. Supreme Court's recent decision in *Rehberg*.

POINT I

PLAINTIFF HAS OPENED THE DOOR TO HIS CRIMINAL HISTORY; DEFENDANTS SHOULD BE PERMITTED TO CROSS-EXAMINE HIM AS TO THAT HISTORY.

Defendants previously moved *in limine* to be permitted to cross examine plaintiff as to his extensive criminal history, which includes two prior felony convictions. Those felonies are

Case: 12-2479 Document: 40-1 Page: 54 09/27/2012 731928 12

A1248

Case 1:10 cv-02714-18W-VVP | Document 69 | Filed 0:1/25/12 | Page 3 of 11 Page D # 1046

admissible under Fed. R. Evid. 609. The Court denied defendants' motion on the ground that such testimony was too prejudicial.¹

During his direct examination on April 24, 2012, plaintiff opened the door to cross examination regarding his criminal history. He gave testimony which falsely implied he had never been incarcerated before – testimony which is patently false.

His testimony was as follows:

Q: How did that make you feel, Mr. Marshall?

A: What, speaking in front of a grand jury?

Q: Yeah.

A: Well, I've never been in a position like that before, so I was very nervous. Never been bombarded with questions, so I didn't really know how to handle the situation. I was thrown off by the whole arrest situation, me being incarcerated. So it was just so much coming at me at one time. But I still gave it a shot, man. You know, I was looking for a good outcome.

Ex. A, Trial Transcript, Marshall Testimony at 24, II. 22-25; at 25, II. 1-6 (emphasis added). That testimony was false, misleading, and prejudicial to the defendants. Moreover, by falsely testifying to the effect that he had not been incarcerated before, he opened the door to examination regarding his prior felony convictions and incarcerations.

Moreover, if the does not allow any of his prior convictions or the fact that he was previously incarcerated to come in and the jury awards damages, they will have no basis to

Defendants again move that the court reconsider its ruling prohibiting defendants from cross-examining plaintiff as to his criminal history. It is well-established law that such history is admissible and relevant, as it goes to credibility. See Williams v. McCarthy, 05 Civ. 10230 (SAS), 2007 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 79151, *4-5 (S.D.N.Y. Oct. 25, 2007) (prior felony convictions were admissible to impeach plaintiff's credibility in part because where "the versions of the events by the parties are radically different, witness credibility will be especially important in this case.") Moreover, it goes to damages. See Banushi v. Palmer, 08-CV-2937(KAM)(JO), 2011 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 419, *7-9 (E.D.N.Y. Jan. 4, 2011) (admitting evidence of plaintiff's prior arrests in trial involving false arrest claim to mitigate plaintiff's claim of damages and noting, "a plaintiff who has had a number of prior arrests and detentions is likely to have suffered less distress than one who has never before been detained") During trial, plaintiff Marshall testified on direct as to his emotional injury from being incarcerated. Accordingly, the number of his prior incarcerations is both admissible and highly relevant.

Case: 12-2479 Document: 40-1 Page: 55 09/27/2012 731928 126

A1249

Clere 1 10-47-02714 JBW-VVP | Document 69 | Filed 04/25/12 | Page 4 of 11 PageID # 1047

determine damages; it would be based on pure speculation. At the very least, they will have the false impression that he has never spent time in jail.

POINT II

PLAINTIFF HAS IMPROPERLY RAISED THE ISSUE OF DEFENDANTS' INITIAL DECISION TO APPROACH PLAINTIFF; BY SO DOING, HE HAS OPENED THE DOOR TO BURBRIDGE'S TESTIMONY REGARDING HIS RECOGNITION OF PLAINTIFF; AT THE VERY LEAST, DEFENDANTS REQUEST A **CURATIVE INSTRUCTION; DEFENDANTS** REQUEST A MISTRIAL IF THE COURT DECLINES TO GIVE JURY A CURATIVE INSTRUCTION WELL AS A RULING THAT PLAINTIFF IS PRECLUDED FROM IMPUGNING THE LEGAL VALIDITY OF THE INITIAL APPROACH IN CLOSING.

Defendants previously moved *in limine* to be permitted to elicit testimony from Officer Burbridge that one factor in his decision to approach plaintiff on May 15, 2008 was that he recognized plaintiff from a police database. The Court denied that motion for two reasons:

(1) it noted that the "initial stop" (or initial approach) was not at issue in this case; and (2) the admission of such testimony would constitute reversible error under the Second Circuit's recent decision in *United States v. Scott*, No. 10-3972-cr (2d Cir. Apr. 6, 2012).

First, the legal validity of the initial approach is simply not at issue in this case. The Court so ruled on April 16, 2012. Since the court's initial ruling, plaintiff's counsel has argued *repeatedly* that defendants acted improperly in their initial approach of plaintiff. (Trial Transcript Unavailable, 4/24). For example, Officer Burbridge was repeatedly questioned as to the reasons for his initial approach:

Q: Prior to the time that you decided to stop Mr. Marshall, had you observed suspicious movements?

A: Yes.

Case: 12-2479 Document: 40-1 Page: 56 09/27/2012 731928 126

A1250

Cace 1/10-by-62714-JBW-VVP | Decument 69 | Filed n4/25/12 | Page 5 of 12 PageID #, 1048

Q: Referring to your deposition on Page 66, Line 23,

"QUESTION: Did you observe any furtive movements by Joshua

Marshall before you decided to stop him?

"ANSWER: No."

MS. CASTRO: Objection. I also note there's an objection at the deposition to that question also.

THE COURT: Overruled.

BY MR. NORINSBERG

Q: Do you recall being asked that question and giving that answer?

A: Yes.

O: You remember that?

A: Yes.

Q: So according to your deposition testimony, you did not observe any suspicious movements by Mr. Marshall before you decided to stop him; true or not true?

MS. CASTRO: Objection. THE COURT: Overruled.

MS. CASTRO: Your Honor, this pertains to your

Honor's in limine rulings.

THE COURT: The reference is to the night from the time of first observation to the time of arrest; is that

correct?

MR. NORINSBERG: Yes.

MS. CASTRO: Your Honor, may we be heard at sidebar?

THE COURT: You may not.

MS. CASTRO: Your Honor, I just note my objection

that counsel's question --

THE COURT: Your objection is always noted. We have a full-time reporter. Proceed with the questioning.

Ex. C, Trial Transcript, Testimony of Michael Burbridge, April 24, 2012 at 124, Il. 6-25; at 125, Il. 1-14.

As a result of plaintiff's improperly making an issue of the initial approach, defendants request that the Court give the jury the following curative instruction: "Ladies and Gentlemen, there is no issue in this case as to whether the officers were permitted to approach and question plaintiff as he walked down the street on May 15, 2008. The only issue you have to decide is whether they had a lawful basis to arrest him for possession of a weapon."

Case: 12-2479 Document: 40-1 Page: 57 09/27/2012 731928 126

A1251

Citian 1 16-14-02714 JRW-VVP - Document 68 - File 6 G-25-12 - Page 6 of 11 Pageio in 1649.

Next, defendants renew their request that Officer Burbridge be permitted to testify that one factor in his decision to approach plaintiff was the fact that he recognized plaintiff from a police database. By its ruling, the Court is preventing him from testifying truthfully. Moreover, plaintiff has opened the door to this line of testimony by repeatedly questioning Officer Burbridge as to the reasons for his initial approach. Finally, the Second Circuit's ruling in *Scott* is simply not analogous here. In the *Scott* case, the Second Circuit ruled in the context of a criminal case that testimony by an officer regarding recognition from a prior encounter was too prejudicial. That case is distinguishable on two grounds: (1) it was a criminal case where the liberty of defendant was at stake, and thus the probative/prejudicial balancing test is different; and (2) the initial approach and/or stop was, in fact, at issue in that case. It is not here. This is a civil action for monetary damages. Defendants submit that the Court is allowing plaintiff to use its *in limine* ruling as both a sword and a shield.

Finally, defendants should be precluded from impugning or otherwise questioning the legal validity of the initial approach during their closing. The Court ruled that it is not at issue in the case, and plaintiff's have completely failed to abide by that ruling.

POINT III

DEFENDANTS SHOULD BE PERMITTED TO CROSS EXAMINE PLAINTIFF AS TO HIS CLAIM OF EMOTIONAL DAMAGES STEMMING FROM HIS INCARCERATION.

During plaintiff's direct examination, he testified that his stay on Rikers Island was unpleasant, depressing, and that he encountered unsavory individuals, at least one of whom had tuberculosis. He testified as follows:

- Q: Can you just describe a little bit for the jury what the conditions were like when you were in jail.
- A: I mean, you're surrounded about everything. You know, you have people with tuberculosis. You got people who just

Case: 12-2479 Document: 40-1 Page: 58 09/27/2012 731928 126

A1252

Case 1.10-cv-6.714-JBW-VVP Document 69 Fileo 04.25/12 Page 7 of 11 Pageth # 1050

don't shower.

Ex. A, Trial Transcript, Testimony of Joshua Marshall, April 24, 2012 at 27, Il. 9-18.

However, plaintiff has abandoned his claim for emotional damages in this case. Specifically, during his deposition, plaintiff gave the following testimony:

Q: Are you seeking to recover for any emotional or psychological injuries?

A: No, no.

Ex. B, Marshall Deposition at 173, II. 9-11 (emphasis added).

Defendants attempted to cross-examine plaintiff regarding his abandonment of that claim, but the objection to such cross-examination was sustained. Defendants request that they be allowed to cross-examine plaintiff as to his abandonment of the emotional damages claim. Allowing plaintiff to testify as to emotional damages, while precluding defendants from cross-examining as to his abandonment of that claim is highly prejudicial. Moreover, plaintiff's testimony about the conditions on Rikers Island creates the impression that he has never been there before, which is clearly not the case given his numerous other arrests and incarcerations. Thus, it goes to his credibility.

POINT IV

DEFENDANTS SHOULD BE PERMITTED TO MENTION IN CLOSING THE FACT THAT PLAINTIFF'S CASE WAS DISMISSED ON SPEEDY TRIAL GROUNDS.

Defendants should be permitted to mention in closing that plaintiff's criminal case was dismissed on speedy trial grounds. Defendants do not dispute that dismissal on speedy trial grounds is a "favorable determination" for purposes of a malicious prosecution claim. That is not at issue. However, defendants should be able to inform the jury of the reason for the dismissal – the simple fact that it was dismissed on speedy trial grounds. This is one of the facts of this case

Case: 12-2479 Document: 40-1 Page: 59 09/27/2012 731928 126

A1253

Case 1:11 ov 62714-JBW-VVP | Document 69 | Filed 04/25/12 | Page 8 of 11 PageID # 1051

and the jury should be allowed to know the basis for the dismissal. Defendants do not intend to characterize a speedy trial dismissal as a "technicality." They simply intend to inform the jury that the case was dismissed. It did not go to trial. It was not "thrown out" by a judge. The factual statement – that the case was dismissed on speedy trial grounds – is not prejudicial to the plaintiff. However, the bald statement that the case was "dismissed," without more, is prejudicial to the defendants.

The case cited by plaintiff in support of his contention that the jury should not be so informed, *Cantalino v. Danner*, 754 N.E.2d 164, 168 (N.Y. 2001), simply does not speak to the issue. It merely holds that for purposes of malicious prosecution, a speedy trial dismissal is considered a "favorable determination." This is not in dispute. Nor does the case preclude defendants from informing the jury of the factual reason for the dismissal of the case.

POINT V

DEFENDANTS REQUEST A CURATIVE INSTRUCTION REGARDING THE IMPORT OF THE GRAND JURY INDICTMENT.

During plaintiff's cross-examination, the Court instructed the jury that "Just because the grand jury indicted does not mean that the plaintiff was guilty." The obverse is also true. Defendants request an instruction that "Just because the case was dismissed does not mean that the plaintiff didn't have the gun." As it stands, the Court's instruction is not even-handed. In its partial form, it is incorrect and highly prejudicial to the defendants.

POINT VI

DEFENDANTS REQUEST A JURY INSTRUCTION THAT THE GRAND JURY'S INDICTMENT CREATES A PRESUMPTION OF PROBABLE CAUSE.

Case: 12-2479 Document: 40-1 Page: 60 09/27/2012 731928 126

A1254

Case 1.15 cv-0z714-JBW-VVP Document 69 - Filed 04/25/12 - Page 9 of 11 PageID +, 1052

Defendants renew their request for a jury instruction that the grand jury's indictment creates a presumption of probable cause. *See Savino v. City of New York*, 331 F.3d 63, 72 (2d Cir. 2003) (indictment by a grand jury creates a presumption of probable cause). To overcome that presumption plaintiff must produce evidence "that the indictment was procured by fraud, perjury, the suppression of evidence or other police conduct undertaken in bad faith." *Alvarado v. City of New York*, 2011 U.S. App. LEXIS 25110 (2d Cir. N.Y. Dec. 19, 2011).

The Court previously rejected defendants' request because the Court reasoned, plaintiff's theory of the case is that the indictment was procured by fraud. Defendants agree that is plaintiff's theory of the case. But that doesn't change the law as to presumptions. The presumption has two parts: a presumption, and criteria by which the presumption may be rebutted. Here, the Court has, in effect, skipped to the second step.

Defendants submit that the failure to give the requested instruction is reversible error. See Rothstein v. Carriere, 373 F.3d 275, 285 (2d Cir. 2004) ("[i]n sum, the district court's erroneous disregard of the presumption that probable cause supported the prosecution of [plaintiff] requires a reversal of the judgment in his favor.")

POINT VI

DEFENDANTS MOVE TO DISMISS BOTH THE MALICIOUS PROSECUTION CLAIM AND THE FAIR TRIAL CLAIM IN LIGHT OF THE U.S. SUPREME COURT'S DECISION IN REHBERG.

Defendants move to dismiss plaintiff's malicious prosecution and fair trial claims in light of the Supreme Court's recent decision in *Rehberg v. Paulk*, 2012 U.S. LEXIS 2711 (Apr. 2, 2012), barring any §1983 action wherein plaintiff's civil rights claims are premised on allegations stemming from grand jury testimony. In that case, the Supreme Court held that jury witnesses are entitled to absolute immunity from "any § 1983 claim based on the witness"

Case: 12-2479 Document: 40-1 Page: 61 09/27/2012 731928 126

A1255

State 19-by 0.713 1899; VAP Declared 69 Filed 34:25/12 Page 10 of 11 PagetO # 1053.

testimony." Rehberg v. Paulk, 2012 U.S. LEXIS 2711 at *23-24 (emphasis added). The Supreme Court went on to underscore the importance of this holding cautioning that "this rule may not be circumvented by claiming that a grand jury witness conspired to present false testimony or by using evidence of the witness' testimony to support any other § 1983 claim concerning the initiation or maintenance of a prosecution." Id. at *24. The reasoning behind granting absolute immunity for grand jury witnesses is the same logic previously used to grant absolute immunity for trial witnesses. Id. at *20-21. The main concern is that the grand jury may be deprived of critical evidence and the truth-seeking function of the tribunal weakened, as a result of a witness' fear of retaliatory litigation. Id. Additionally, the potential of civil liability is not necessary to prevent false testimony, as there are other sanctions in place, such as prosecution for perjury, which provides a sufficient deterrent. Id. at *21.

In addition to granting a witness absolute immunity for grand jury testimony, importantly, *Rehberg* also states that a law enforcement officer does not initiate a prosecution, a necessary factor of the malicious prosecution standard, by testifying before a grand jury. *Rehberg*, 2012 U.S. LEXIS 2711 at *27 - *28. The Supreme Court stated "[b]y testifying before a grand jury, a law enforcement officer does not perform the function of applying for an arrest warrant; nor does such an officer make the critical decision to initiate a prosecution ... such a witness, unlike a complaining witness at common law, does not make the decision to press criminal charges." *Id.* at *27. Indeed, the Court recognized the inherent unfairness in allowing a testifying officer to be civilly liable for a malicious prosecution action, yet insulate a prosecutor who in fact initiates and actively prosecutes a matter. *Id.* at *28 ("it is almost always a prosecutor who is responsible for the decision to present a case to a grand jury ... [i]t would thus be anomalous to permit a police officer who testifies before a grand jury to be sued for maliciously procuring an unjust prosecution when it is the prosecutor, who is shielded by

Case: 12-2479 Document: 40-1 Page: 62 09/27/2012 731928 126

A1256

3. Page 116 to 92514 (IBW VVP) Document 69 Filter of P342 Page 11 of 11 PagerD #, 1954

absolute immunity, who is actually responsible for the decision to prosecute."). The Court went on to hold that this rule cannot be circumvented by claiming that a grand jury witness conspired to present false testimony. *Id.* at *24.

Accordingly, any purported claims against the defendant officers must be dismissed because they did not initiate the underlying prosecution.

Moreover, in light of *Rehberg*, to the extent plaintiff's denial of fair trial claim is based upon the alleged false testimony of the defendant officers before the grand jury, any such claim must now be dismissed as a matter of law.

CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons, defendants Police Officers Salim Randall and Michael Burbridge respectfully request that the Court grant their motions in their entirety and for such other and further relief as the Court deems just and proper.

Dated:

New York, New York April 25, 2012

> MICHAEL A. CARDOZO Corporation Counsel of the City of New York Attorney for Defendants Police Officers Salim

Randall and Michael Burbridge 100 Church Street New York, New York 10007

(212) 788-0303

By: /s/ Felicia Gross Assistant Corporation Counsel

Special Federal Litigation Division

Johana V. Castro

Senior Counsel Special Federal Litigation Division

By:

Case: 12-2479 Document: 40-1 Page: 63 09/27/2012 731928 126

A1257

EXHIBIT A - ANNEXED TO THE DEFENDANTS' BRIEF, DATED APRIL 25, 2012

Excerpt of Trial Transcript, Dated April 23, 2012

(pp. A1257-A1262)

REPRODUCED FOLLOWING

A1258

Case 1.10-cv-02714-JBW-VVP | Document 70 | Filed 04/25/12 | Page 1 of 14 PageID #: 1055

EXHIBIT A

A1259

Cond 1:10-cv-02714-JBW-MvP Document 70 Filed 9/25/12 Page 2 of 14 PageID #: 1056

	1
1	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT EASTERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK
2	JOSHUA MARSHALL,
3	Plaintiff,
4	versus 10-CV-02714
5	THE CITY OF NEW YORK, Defendant. United States Courthouse
6	Brooklyn, New York
7	April 23, 2012
8	9:30 A.M.
9	EXCERPT OF TRANSCRIPT OF TRIAL TESTIMONY OF JOSHUA MARSHALL
10	Before: HON. JACK B. WEINSTEIN, UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
11	APPEARANCES.
12	FOR THE PLAINTIFF:
13	COLIEN & FITCH LL B
14	COHEN & FITCH, LLP Attorneys for the Plaintiff
15	Woolworth Building 233 Broadway - Suite 1800
16	New York, New York 10279
17	BY: GERALD M. COHEN, ESQ.
18	JON NORINSBERG, ESQ.
19	
20	For the Defendants:
21	NEW YORK CITY LAW DEPARTMENT Attorney for the Defendant
22	100 Church Street New York, New York 10007
23	BY: FELICIA GROSS, ESQ.
24	JOHANA CASTRO, ESQ.
25	FRANCES SANDS, ESQ.
	JUDI JOHNSON, RPR. CRR. CLR

A1260

Case 1.10-cv 02714-JBW-VVP | Document 70 | Filed 04/25/12 | Page 3 of 14 Page D # 1057

24 DIRECT - J. MARSHALL would be a situation where I would be able to present my case 1 to -- among peers. And it was an opportunity, and I should go 3 for it. Now, was your attorney present when you testified in the 4 5 grand jury? Yes. 6 Α And was your attorney allowed to ask you any questions 8 while this case was presented to the grand jury? MS. GROSS: Objection. 9 10 THE COURT: Overruled. THE WITNESS: No. 11 BY MR. COHEN 12 13 Who was the only person questioning you in the grand 14 jury? The district attorney. 15 A Now, Mr. Marshall, had you ever testified in a grand jury 16 before this incident? 17 No. 18 MS. GROSS: Objection, your Honor. Objection. 19 20 THE COURT: Overruled. BY MR. COHEN 21 How did that make you feel, Mr. Marshall? 22 What, speaking in front of a grand jury? 23 Yeah. 24 Q 25 Well, I've never been in a position like that before, so

A1261

Clare 1-10 (1992) 14 JBM-VVP | Decomercial Carea Carifold Page 4 of 14 Page(Dir. 1958)

	25
	DIRECT - J. MARSHALL
1	I was very nervous. Never been bombarded with questions, so I
2	didn't really know how to handle the situation. I was thrown
3	off by the whole arrest situation, me being incarcerated. So
4	it was just so much coming at me at one time. But I still
5	gave it a shot, man. You know, I was looking for a good
6	outcome.
7	Q Did you get a good outcome?
8	A No.
9	Q What happened, Mr. Marshall?
10	A I was indicted.
11	Q What happened after you were indicted? Where did you go?
12	A Right back to Rikers Island.
13	Q At that point, what was your understanding of where your
14	criminal case was going?
15	A Trial.
16	Q Why did you know the case was going to trial?
17	A Because I was not giving a guilty plea.
18	Q Can you tell the members of the jury why you weren't
19	going to plead guilty in this case.
20	A Because I was going to plead my innocence to the end.
21	Q Now, without telling the jury, again, what was said, did
22	you have discussions with your attorney about the risks of
23	taking a case like this to trial?
24	A Yes.
25	Q What was your understanding of the risks of fighting a

Case 1:10-cv-02714-JBW-VVP | Document 70 | Filed 04/25 12 | Page 5 of 14 Page D ± 1059

	DIRECT - J. MARSHALL
1	Q Did there come a time when you were actually finally
2	released from jail with respect to these charges?
3	A Yes.
4	Q When were you released from jail?
5	A The end of September. I don't know the exact date.
6	Q So approximately how long were you in jail in connection
7	with these charges?
8	A Four and a half months.
9	Q Can you just describe a little bit for the jury what the
10	conditions were like when you were in jail.
11	A I mean, you're surrounded about everything. You know,
12	you have people with tuberculosis. You got people who just
13	don't shower, You know
14	MS. GROSS: Objection, your Honor.
15	THE WITNESS: the eating situation is horrible.
16	THE COURT: I'll allow it briefly.
17	THE WITNESS: It was just depressing. It was very
18	depressing, very overwhelming. Yeah, very disturbing.
19	BY MR. COHEN
20	Q Now, after you were released from jail, were you still
21	required to come back to court with respect to these charges?
22	A Yes.
23	Q How many times did you have to come back to court?
24	A Approximately eight times.
25	Q How long was this case pending after you were released

Case: 12-2479 Document: 40-1 Page: 69 09/27/2012 731928 126

A1263

EXHIBIT B - ANNEXED TO THE DEFENDANTS' BRIEF, DATED APRIL 25, 2012

Excerpt of Examination Before Trial Transcript of Joshua Marshall, Dated April 26, 2011 (pp. A1263-A1266)

REPRODUCED FOLLOWING

A1264

Case 1.10-cv-02714-JBW-VVP | Document 70 | Filed 64/25/12 | Page 6 of 14 PageID #. 1060

EXHIBIT B

Case: 12-2479 Document: 40-1 Page: 71 09/27/2012 731928 126

A1265

COPY

1

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

JOSHUA MARSHALL,

Plaintiff,

-against-

THE CITY OF NEW YORK, Et. Al,

Defendants.

EXAMINATION BEFORE TRIAL

Of the Plaintiff, JOSHUA MARSHALL, held on Tuesday, April 26, 2011, commencing at 10:26 a.m., at Sing Sing Correctional Facility, 354 Hunter Road, Ossining, New York, before Amelia Moller, a Shorthand Reporter and a Notary Public in and for the State of New York.

Close 1 (2) 2 (27/14-18W-2VP - Document 70 | Fred Guidbritz - Pombillo (14 Prognit) in 1062

JOSHUA MARSHALL 10R3164

173

- 1 Q. That was legal aide?
- 2 A. At that moment, yes.
- 3 Q. So basically the money for the bail and
- 4 the lost wages, correct?
- 5 A. Yes.
- 6 Q. Are you seeking to recover for any
- 7 physical injuries?
- 8 A. No.
- 9 Q. Are you seeking to recover for any
- 10 emotional or psychological injuries?
- 11 A. No, no.
- 12 Q. Are you seeking to recover for any damage
- to your reputation that might have
- 14 resulted from this arrest?
- 15 A. No.
- 16 Q. So, it would be for the economic damage
- and the loss of your liberty the fact
- that you were incarcerated, correct?
- 19 A. Correct.
- 20 Q. Okay. Have you ever been incarcerated on
- other occasions other than as a result of
- this incident here and the second
- 23 incident that happened in May of 2009?
- 24 A. Have I ever been incarcerated before
- other than these two incidents?

Case: 12-2479 Document: 40-1 Page: 73 09/27/2012 731928 126

A1267

EXHIBIT C - ANNEXED TO THE DEFENDANTS' BRIEF, DATED APRIL 25, 2012

Excerpt of Trial Transcript, Dated April 24, 2012

(pp. A1267-A1273)

REPRODUCED FOLLOWING

A1268

Thursday 11 to 1771 FIRMAND Disconners 10 Takes 64 25/42 Pages of 14 PagesDist, 1063

EXHIBIT C

A1269

TO BE 110 FOR 1871 FUEW/ Vivin December 70 Fixed 04/25/12 Page 10 of 14 PageID # 1064

	1
1	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT EASTERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK
2	JOSHUA MARSHALL,
3	Plaintiff,
4	versus 10-CV-02714 (JBW)
5	THE CITY OF NEW YORK, Defendant. United States Courthouse
6	Brooklyn, New York
7	
8	April 23, 2012 9:30 A.M.
9	TRANSCRIPT OF TRIAL
10	Before: HON. JACK B. WEINSTEIN, UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
11	
12	APPEARANCES: FOR THE PLAINTIFF:
13	
14	COHEN & FITCH, LLP Attorneys for the Plaintiff
15	Woolworth Building 233 Broadway - Suite 1800
	New York, New York 10279
16	
17	BY: GERALD M. COHEN, ESQ. JON NORINSBERG, ESQ.
18	
19	
20	For the Defendants:
21	NEW YORK CITY LAW DEPARTMENT Attorney for the Defendant
22	100 Church Street New York, New York 10007
23	BY: FELICIA GROSS, ESQ.
24	JOHANA CASTRO, ESQ.
25	FRANCES SANDS, ESQ.

A1270

Case Could by BVe-Vivin Document 70 Filled 64/25/02 Page 11 of 14 PagerD # 10oC

	DIRECT - OFFICER BURBRIDGE					
1	right?					
2	A Yes, I did.					
3	Q And then shortly after you saw Mr. Marshall, you made a					
4	decision to stop these two; is that correct?					
5	A Yes,					
6	Q And would you agree, Officer Burbridge, that it was only					
7	a matter of seconds from the time you first saw Mr. Marshall					
8	until the time you stopped him?					
9	A Yes.					
10	Q Now, you're familiar about what's known as furtive					
11	movements, right?					
12	A That's correct.					
13	Q Furtive movements would be something of a suspicious					
14	movement, right?					
15	A That's correct.					
16	Q Furtive movements would be an evasive movement, right?					
17	A That's correct.					
18	Q Can you please tell the members of this jury, did you					
19	observe any furtive movements by Mr. Marshall before you					
20	decided to stop him?					
21	MS. CASTRO: Objection. Your Honor, the stop is not					
22	in question. Further, counsel is diving into questions that					
23	are inappropriate.					
24	THE COURT: You may continue. Overruled.					
25	THE WITNESS: I'm sorry, could you restate that.					

A1271

10 cz 32714-28W-VVP Document z Fled 04/25/12 Page 12 of 14 PageID # 1066

	DIRECT - OFFICER BURBRIDGE					
1	BY MR. NORINSBERG					
2	Q Prior to the time that you saw Mr. Marshall, did you					
3	observe any furtive movements before you decided to stop him?					
4	A Can you rephrase it.					
5	MR. NORINSBERG: Strike it.					
6	BY MR. NORINSBERG					
7	Q Prior to the time that you decided to stop Mr. Marshall,					
8	had you observed suspicious movements?					
9	A Yes.					
10	Q Referring to your deposition on Page 66, Line 23,					
11	"QUESTION: Did you observe any furtive movements by Joshua					
12	Marshall before you decided to stop him?					
13	"ANSWER: No."					
14	MS. CASTRO: Objection. I also note there's an					
15	objection at the deposition to that question also.					
16	THE COURT: Overruled.					
17	BY MR. NORINSBERG					
18	Q Do you recall being asked that question and giving that					
19	answer?					
20	A Yes.					
21	Q You remember that?					
22	A Yes.					
23	Q So according to your deposition testimony, you did not					
24	observe any suspicious movements by Mr. Marshall before you					
25	decided to stop him; true or not true?					

A1272

Case 1.10-cv-02714-JBW-VVP | Document 70 | Filed 04/25/12 | Page 13 of 14 PageiD # 1067

	125
	DIRECT - OFFICER BURBRIDGE
1	MS. CASTRO: Objection.
2	THE COURT: Overruled.
3	MS. CASTRO: Your Honor, this pertains to your
4	Honor's in limine rulings.
5	THE COURT: The reference is to the night from the
6	time of first observation to the time of arrest; is that
7	correct?
8	MR. NORINSBERG: Yes.
9	MS. CASTRO: Your Honor, may we be heard at sidebar?
10	THE COURT: You may not.
11	MS. CASTRO: Your Honor, I just note my objection
12	that counsel's question
13	THE COURT: Your objection is always noted. We have
14	a full-time reporter. Proceed with the questioning.
15	BY MR. NORINSBERG
16	Q Now, before you decided to stop Mr. Marshall, you hadn't
17	activated your sirens at that point, correct?
18	A That's correct.
19	Q You hadn't activated your flashing lights, correct?
20	A That's correct.
21	Q You hadn't yelled out, "Stop, police," or words to that
22	effect; is that right?
23	A That's correct.
24	Q You hadn't made any effort to stop these two individuals;
25	is that correct?

A1273

Case 1 10-cv-02714-JBW-VVP | Document 70 | Filed 04/25/12 | Page 14 of 14 PageID # 1068

	DIRECT - OFFICER BURBRIDGE
1	A That's correct.
2	Q Did you see Mr. Marshall's eyes bulging as he was walking
3	down the street?
4	A I don't remember them bulging.
5	Q Did you see him suddenly stop in his tracks and look
6	scared when he saw your police car?
7	A Yes.
8	Q You saw that, right?
9	A Yes, I did.
10	Q Even though you said in your deposition you didn't
11	observe anything suspicious, right?
12	MS. CASTRO: Objection.
13	BY MR. NORINSBERG
14	Q Now, after you saw Mr. Marshall, the police vehicle made
15	a right onto Park Street, isn't that true?
16	A That's true.
17	Q So you were here just a few moments before when Officer
18	Randall was giving his testimony, correct?
19	A That's correct.
20	Q And you saw Officer Randall explain to the jury where
21	things were on that photograph, correct?
22	A That's correct.
23	Q And you saw Officer Randall say that the police vehicle
24	actually was coming from the other side of Broadway and made a
25	left onto Park Street, true?

Case: 12-2479 Document: 40-1 Page: 80 09/27/2012 731928 126

A1274

DEFENDANTS' MOTION FOR A MISTRIAL/ MEMORANDUM OF LAW , $\frac{\text{DATED APRIL 26, 2012}}{\text{(pp. A1274-A1285)}}$

REPRODUCED FOLLOWING

Case: 12-2479 Document: 40-1 Page: 81 09/27/2012 731928 126

A1275

Cute 1.10 cv-02714 JBW-VVP | Document 71 | Filed 04/20/12 | Page 1 of 11 PageiD vi 1069

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT EASTERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK	
JOSHUA MARSHALL,	
Plaintiff,	
-against-	
P.O. SALIM RANDALL, and P.O. MICHAEL BURBRIDGE,	10 Civ. 2714 (JBW)(VVP)
Defendants.	

<u>DEFENDANTS' MOTION FOR A MISTRIAL AND MEMORANDUM OF LAW IN SUPPORT THEREOF</u>

FELICIA GROSS
JOHANA CASTRO
MICHAEL A. CARDOZO
Corporation Counsel of the City of New York
100 Church Street
New York, New York 10007
(212) 788-0303
fgross@law.nyc.gov
jcastro@law.nyc.gov

Attorneys for Defendants

Case: 12-2479 Document: 40-1 Page: 82 09/27/2012 731928 126

A1276

Case 1.10-cv-02714-JBW VVP | Document 71 | Filed 64/26/12 | Page 2 of 11 PageID # 1070

PRELIMINARY STATEMENT

Trial commenced in this matter on April 23, 2012 before the Honorable Jack B. Weinstein, United States District Judge. After the close of evidence, the Court instructed the jury by reading a jury charge.

Defendants respectfully submit that the jury charge, and subsequent "clarification," (supplemental charge) was erroneous in several respects, namely: (1) the Court misstated the law with respect to whether the jury may award punitive damages in the absence of compensatory damages; (2) the Court misstated the law with respect to plaintiff's psychological or emotional damages; (3) plaintiff was improperly permitted to ask the jury to "send a message" not just to these defendants but to all putative malfeasors; and (4) because defendants were precluded from introducing evidence of plaintiff's prior incarcerations, any damage award is speculative; (5) plaintiff improperly argued during closing that defendants made misleading statements to the grand jury, which is not a proper basis for liability under *Rehberg*; (6) the Court misread the jury charge with respect to defendants' potential liability for testimony before the grand jury in contravention of *Rehberg*; and (7) defendants request the attached special interrogatories.

Now come the defendants respectfully submitting that the error in the various jury charges is so prejudicial as to render the jury unable to reach a fair verdict. Accordingly, defendants move for a mistrial.

POINT I

THE COURT ERRED IN INSTRUCTING THE JURY THAT IT MAY AWARD PUNITIVE DAMAGES IN THE ABSENCE OF COMPENSATORY DAMAGES.

Case: 12-2479 Document: 40-1 Page: 83 09/27/2012 731928 126

A1277

Case 1:10-cv-02714-JBW-VVP | Document 71 | Filed 04/26/12 | Page 3 of 11 Page D #: 1071

During its charge conference, the Court properly instructed the jury that: "If you award compensatory damages, you may award additional punitive damages if you find that a defendant engaged in extraordinary misconduct." Jury Instructions, Section IV, Part B (April 24, 2012, 4:51 PM Version). After giving such instruction, the jury submitted a note containing the following question, in sum or in substance: "Can we award punitive damages without first awarding compensatory damages? Section IV.B." The Court correctly informed them the answer was no. However, after conducting further research, the Court assembled the jury and gave them the following supplemental jury charge:

THE COURT: Assuming you find liability -- and I'm not saying you should or shouldn't, do you understand? If you find liability, and flowing from that liability as a proximate cause was deprival of the Plaintiff's liberty, either while he was arrested in violation of his rights -- if you find that -- or for another reason in violation of his rights, he was incarcerated for a substantial length of time, then he is entitled to compensatory damages. Do you understand that?

(Jury nodding.)

THE COURT: How much is for you to decide. So the question, "Can we give punitive awards without giving compensatory," theoretically, you can. You can give punitive without compensatory if you found liability. Do you understand?

(Jury nodding.)

Ex. B, Trial Transcript, April 25, 2012 at 139, II. 16-25; at 140, II. 1-4 (emphasis added). The Court's supplemental instruction was a misstatement of the law.

Prior to 2004, it was black letter law that a jury could award punitive damages in the absence of compensatory damages so long as it first found liability and awarded nominal damages. See, e.g., Robinson v. Cattaraugus County, 147 F.3d 153, 161 (2d Cir. N.Y. 1998). In that case, the jury made the same inquiry, in sum or in substance, of the district court as it did

Case: 12-2479 Document: 40-1 Page: 84 09/27/2012 731928 126

A1278

Chile 1:10-ras02714-JBW-VVP - Document 71 - Faled 04/26/12 - Page 4 of 11 PageID #. 1072

here (*i.e.*, can punitive damages be awarded in the absence of compensatory damages?). The Second Circuit held that the district court properly gave the following instruction in response to the jury's question:

[t]he Supreme Court has expressed the law that there are circumstances where a jury can find that there has been violation of a person's constitutional right, but then under the circumstances they find that there is no compensatory damage, that is, there is no pain and suffering, there is no lost wages, there are no other elements of any compensatory damage. In that case the Supreme Court says that it is proper to make an award of nominal damage, usually in the amount of one dollar. And if there is a finding of liability, if there is a finding that there should be an award of nominal damage, even if there are no additional compensatory damages found, then the jury may go to consider whether or not punitive damages should be awarded under the circumstances.

Robinson, 147 F.3d at 161 (emphasis added).

However, in 2004, a bedrock principle – that jurors could award nominal damages in constitutional rights deprivation cases – was altered by the Second Circuit in its decision in *Kerman v. City of New York*, 374 F.3d 93, 124 (2d Cir. N.Y. 2004). In the *Kerman* case, the court held that "where [a] plaintiff was indisputably deprived of his liberty, and the conduct of the defendant responsible for the deprivation was found to be unlawful, we have held that the plaintiff is entitled to compensatory, not merely nominal, damages." Because the jury awarded nominal damages, the Second Circuit reversed and remanded for a new trial. Under Kerman, nominal damages are no longer available for loss of liberty claims.

Robinson and Kerman address different issues, and are in tension with one another. Kerman's effect on the question of whether punitive damages may be awarded in the absence of compensatory damages, if any, is unclear.

In State Farm Mut. Auto. Ins. Co. v. Campbell, 538 U.S. 408, 419 (2003), the Supreme Court again addressed the interrelationship between compensatory and punitive damages. In that case, it held that punitive damages must have a proportionate ratio to compensatory damages in

Case: 12-2479 Document: 40-1 Page: 85 09/27/2012 731928 126

A1279

Case 1 L0-cv 02714-JBW-VVP | Document 71 | Filea 04/25/12 | Page 5 of 11 PageID # 1073

order to comport with due process.¹ It further held that the \$145 million punitive damage award in that case did not satisfy due process, and reversed and remanded for a remittitur or new trial. In so holding, the Supreme Court reasoned as follows:

[T]he most important indicium of the reasonableness of a punitive damages award is the degree of reprehensibility of the defendant's conduct." *Gore*, supra, at 575. We have instructed courts to determine the reprehensibility of a defendant by considering whether: the harm caused was physical as opposed to economic; the tortious conduct evinced an indifference to or a reckless disregard of the health or safety of others; the target of the conduct had financial vulnerability; the conduct involved repeated actions or was an isolated incident; and the harm was the result of intentional malice, trickery, or deceit, or mere accident. 517 U.S., at 576-577. The existence of any one of these factors weighing in favor of a plaintiff may not be sufficient to sustain a punitive damages award; and the absence of all of them renders any award suspect. *It should be presumed a plaintiff has been made whole for his injuries by compensatory damages, so punitive damages should only be awarded if the defendant's culpability, after having paid compensatory damages, is so reprehensible as to warrant the imposition of further sanctions to achieve punishment or deterrence. <i>Id.*, at 575.

State Farm, 538 U.S. at 419 (emphasis added).

As a result of *State Farm*, the landscape with respect to the relationship between compensatory and punitive damages has shifted. Nevertheless, defendants submit that, as articulated by the U.S. Supreme Court in *State Farm*, punitive damages are *not* recoverable in the absence of compensatory damages. *State Farm* effectively overruled *Robinson*.

Therefore, the Court erred when it gave a supplemental instruction to the jury to the effect that that punitive damages may, in fact, be awarded in the absence of compensatory damages. Moreover, given the language of the supplemental jury instruction, the jury is now

¹ The Court's reasoning was as follows: "Our jurisprudence and the principles it has now established demonstrate, however, that, in practice, [footnote omitted] few awards exceeding a single-digit ratio between punitive and compensatory damages, to a significant degree, will satisfy due process. In *Haslip*, in upholding a punitive damages award, we concluded that an award of more than four times the amount of compensatory damages might be close to the line of constitutional impropriety. 499 U.S., at 23-24. We cited that 4-to-1 ratio again in *Gore*. 517 U.S., at 581." *State Farm*, 538 U.S. at 425 (2003).

Case: 12-2479 Document: 40-1 Page: 86 09/27/2012 731928 126

A1280

Case 1.13 cv-(2714-J8M-VVF) Decument 71 Filed 04/26/12 Page 6 of 11 PageID #: 1074

compelled to award both compensatory and punitive damages. Defendants do not believe a curative instruction is possible in light of the fact that the jury has already been given two charges on the issue. Accordingly, defendants have no choice but to request a mistrial.

POINT II

THE COURT MISSTATED THE LAW WITH RESPECT TO PLAINTIFF'S SEEKING MENTAL AND EMOTIONAL DAMAGES.

Prior to instructing the jury, the Court heard argument on defendants' objections to the charge. After such argument, the Court inserted the following instruction into the jury charge: "Plaintiff claims as the injury that he spent four and a half months in jail. *He is not seeking recovery for any emotional or psychological injuries.* He is not seeking recovery for loss of earnings." Jury Charge, April 25, 2012, Section IV (Damages), Part A (Compensatory Damages) at p. 11 (emphasis added).

However, during the charge, the Court added new language which fundamentally altered the import. The Court stated:

THE COURT:

The plaintiff claims as the injury that he spent four and a half months in jail. He is not seeking recovery for any emotional or psychological injuries. He is not seeking recovery for loss of earnings. That is, for any emotional or psychological injuries that continued after the jail. He is seeking damages for the time he spent in jail.

Ex. B, Trial Transcript, April 25, 2012 at 126, II. 15-20 (emphasis added).

This is an incorrect statement of the case. He is not seeking to recover for emotional or psychological injuries at all. He is seeking damages for loss of liberty.

Case: 12-2479 Document: 40-1 Page: 87 09/27/2012 731928 126

A1281

Case 1:10-cv-02714-JBW-VVP | Document 71 | Filed 04/26/12 | Page 7 of 11 PageID #: 1075

POINT III

THE COURT PERMITTED PLAINTIFF TO ASK THE JURY TO "SEND A MESSAGE" NOT JUST TO THESE DEFENDANTS BUT TO ALL PUTATIVE MALFEASORS.

During plaintiff's closing argument, he stated as follows:

MR. NORINSBERG:

But there's one section, the last section on punitive damages, that I do want you to take very seriously. Punitive damages gives you an opportunity to speak your voice and actually be heard as a juror. You can send a message to these two Defendants.

MS. CASTRO: Objection.

MR. NORINSBERG: *You can send a message*. THE COURT: You may continue your argument.

MR. NORINSBERG: You can send a message through your verdict, not just to these two Defendants, but to any other police officer out there that thinks it's okay to get in front of a grand jury and lie. You can send a message to any other police officer out there that thinks it's okay.

THE COURT: Strike that reference to before the

grand jury.

MR. NORINSBERG: You can send a message to any other police officer that thinks it's okay to tell a prosecutor something that's completely false, and say, you know what, you can't do that. You actually cannot do that in our system. You will be accountable. And that's what we're going to ask you to do at the end of the day is listen to all of the evidence, work through it carefully. But if you do that and you honor the pledges you made in your jury selection, you're going to get the right result, and that's to hold these two Defendants responsible for putting this man in jail for four and a half months. Thank you.

THE COURT: Thank you.

Ex. B, Trial Transcript, April 25, 2012 at 92, Il. 22-25; at 93, Il. 1-23 (emphases added).

Defendants submit that this line of argument is inflammatory, highly prejudicial, and should have been excluded. *See, e.g., Morales v. City of New York*, 2000 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 18711 (S.D.N.Y. 2000) (allowing plaintiff's motion for remittutur or new trial where punitive damage award was excessive; concluding, *inter alia*, that "[t]he plaintiff's summation asked the

Case: 12-2479 Document: 40-1 Page: 88 09/27/2012 731928 126

A1282

Case 1:10-cv-02714-JBW-VVP | Document 71 | Filed 04/26/12 | Page 8 of 11 Page(D #, 1076

jury to 'send a message' to the police by their verdict. While this plea was made in connection with the argument on punitive damages, the jury may not have appreciated that such an argument was only relevant to a determination of punitive damages.').

POINT IV

BECAUSE DEFENDANTS WERE PRECLUDED FROM INTRODUCING EVIDENCE OF PLAINTIFF'S PRIOR INCARCERATIONS, ANY DAMAGE AWARD IS SPECULATIVE.

Assuming the jury returns a damages award for loss of liberty, the defense was precluded from eliciting testimony concerning plaintiff's prior criminal convictions and incarcerations so there is nothing in the record from which the jury can base a damage award. Any such award would be purely speculative.

Defendants have repeatedly moved that the court permit defendants to elicit testimony or cross-examining plaintiff as to his criminal history. It is well-established law that such history goes directly to damages. *See Banushi v. Palmer*, 08-CV-2937(KAM)(JO), 2011 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 419, *7-9 (E.D.N.Y. Jan. 4, 2011) (admitting evidence of plaintiff's prior arrests in trial involving false arrest claim to mitigate plaintiff's claim of damages and noting, "a plaintiff 'who has had a number of prior arrests and detentions is likely to have suffered less distress than one who has never before been detained"). During trial, plaintiff Marshall testified on direct as to his emotional injury from being incarcerated. Accordingly, the number of his prior incarcerations is both admissible and highly relevant to damages.

POINT V

PLAINTIFF IMPROPERLY ARGUED DURING CLOSING THAT DEFENDANTS MADE MISLEADING STATEMENTS TO THE GRAND JURY, WHICH IS NOT A

Case: 12-2479 Document: 40-1 Page: 89 09/27/2012 731928 126

A1283

Case 1 10-cv-02714-JBW-VVP | Document 71 | Filed 04/26/12 | Page 9 of 11 PageID # 1077

PROPER BASIS FOR LIABILITY UNDER REHBERG.

Finally, in his closing, plaintiff's counsel improperly argued that the defendants mislead the "grand jury." He argued:

MR. NORINSBERG:

Now, you'll see the sections on compensatory damages, I don't even want to touch that with you. I want this case -- I don't want to taint this about this case being a money case. This is about holding these officers accountable. Whatever value you put on it is fine. It's about showing that you were not fooled like these other people. You weren't mislead like the grand jury. You see the light here. You understand what happened.

Ex. B, Trial Transcript, April 25, 2012 at 92, II. 14-21 (emphasis added).

Plaintiff's counsel made additional references to defendants' having mislead the grand jury several other times during his closing. *See, e.g.*, p. 74, line 8 ("What he told the *grand jury* was a lie."); p. 76, line I ("What he told that *grand jury* is a lie."); p. 79, line 17 and 20-21 When he appeared before the *grand jury*, one story. When he appeared in the civil lawsuit, another story. ** He testified under oath in front of that *grand jury* that what happened was he had this conversation with Marshall that he said, "Sir, can I talk to you for a minute?"); and p. 93, lines 10-11 ("You can send a message through your verdict, not just to these two Defendants, but to any other police officer out there that thinks it's okay to get in front of a *grand jury* and lie.") (emphases added).

His argument is misleading and confusing. It may give the jury reason to believe that misstatements to the grand jury is a basis for liability, which it is not under the U.S. Supreme Court's recent decision in *Rehberg v. Paulk*, 2012 U.S. LEXIS 2711, *23-24 (Apr. 2, 2012). *See*

Case: 12-2479 Document: 40-1 Page: 90 09/27/2012 731928 126

A1284

Case 1:10-cv-02714-JBW VVP | Document 71 | Filed 04/26/12 | Page 10 of 11 PageiD > 1078

id. (holding that grand jury witnesses are entitled to absolute immunity from "any § 1983 claim based on the witness' testimony").

POINT VI

THE COURT MISREAD THE JURY CHARGE WITH RESPECT TO DEFENDANTS' POTENTIAL LIABILITY FOR TESTIMONY BEFORE THE GRAND JURY IN CONTRAVENTION OF REHBERG.

During the jury charge, the Court misread a crucial instruction. The Court stated:

THE COURT

Did Officer Randall violate the plaintiff's constitutional right to a fair trial by knowingly presenting false evidence to the prosecutor? I'm sorry, in preparation for the grand jury.

Ex. B, Trial Transcript, April 25, 2012 at 129, II. 8-12 (emphasis added).

Even though the Court corrected the mistake, the confusion created on a crucial point is highly prejudicial.

POINT VII

DEFENDANTS REQUEST THE ATTACHED SPECIAL INTERROGATORIES.

Finally, defendants request that the attached special interrogatories be given to the jury after it has reached its verdict. *See* Exhibit A.

CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons, defendants Police Officers Salim Randall and Michael Burbridge respectfully request that the Court grant their motions in their entirety and for such other and further relief as the Court deems just and proper.

Dated: New York, New York April 26, 2012 Case: 12-2479 Document: 40-1 Page: 91 09/27/2012 731928 126

A1285

Case 1:10-cy-02714-JBW-VVP | Document 71 | Fried 04/26/12 | Page 11 of 11 PageID #: 1079

MICHAEL A. CARDOZO Corporation Counsel of the City of New York Attorney for Defendants Police Officers Salim Randall and Michael Burbridge 100 Church Street New York, New York 10007 (212) 788-0303

By:	/s/
-	Felicia Gross
	Assistant Corporation Counsel
	Special Federal Litigation Division
By:	/s/
	Johana V. Castro
	Senior Counsel
	Special Federal Litigation Division

Case: 12-2479 Document: 40-1 Page: 92 09/27/2012 731928 126

A1286

EXHIBIT A - ANNEXED TO DEFENDANTS' MOTION FOR A MISTRIAL/MEMORANDUM OF LAW Excerpt of Special Interrogatories (pp. A1286-A1288)

REPRODUCED FOLLOWING

A1287

Case 1 10-cv-02714-JBW-VVP | Document 71-1 | Filed 04/26/12 | Page 1 of 12 PageID #: 1080

EXHIBIT A

Case: 12-2479 Document: 40-1 Page: 94 09/27/2012 731928 126

A1288

Case 1 nd cv-02714-JBW-VVP | Document 71-1 | Filed 04/26/12 | Page 2 of 12 PageID #: 1081

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT EASTERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK	v
JOSHUA MARSHALL, Plaintiff, -against- POLICE OFFICER SALIM RANDALL and PO OFFICER MICHAEL BURBRIDGE, Defendants.	DLICE
	10 Civ. 2714 (JBW)(VVP)
Special Interrogatories	
1) Was it reasonable for Officer Randall to	believe that plaintiff had a gun.
Yes	No
2) Was it reasonable for Officer Burbridge	to believe that plaintiff had a gun.
Yes	No
3) Did Officer Randall knowingly mislead	the prosecutor to procure an indictment.
Yes	No
4) Did Officer Burbridge knowingly mislea	nd the prosecutor to procure an indictment.
Yes	No
5) Did Officer Randall knowingly present f	alse information to the prosecutor.
Yes	No
6) Did Officer Burbridge knowing present	false information to the prosecutor.
Yes	No

Case: 12-2479 Document: 40-1 Page: 95 09/27/2012 731928 126

A1289

EXHIBIT B - ANNEXED TO DEFENDANTS' MOTION <u>FOR A MISTRIAL/MEMORANDUM OF LAW</u> Excerpt of Trial Transcript Dated April 25, 2012 (pp. A1289-A1299)

REPRODUCED FOLLOWING

Case: 12-2479 Document: 40-1 Page: 96 09/27/2012 731928 126

A1290

EXHIBIT B

09/27/2012

A1291

Case 1:10-cv-02714-JBW-VVP | Document 71-1 | Filed 04/26/12 | Page 4 of 12 PageID #. 1083

1	i	1	PROCEEDINGS	2
ı	EXSTERATATER PER SE SOUBLE	1	Court Reporter: Judi Johnson, RPR, CRR, CLR Official Court Reporter Telephone: (718) 613-282 [acsimile: (718) 613-2480 [acsimile: (718) 613-2480 [acsimile: (718) 613-2480 [acsimile: Judi_Johnson(@nyed.uscourts.gov	
2		2	Telephone: (718) 613-2582	
3	JOSHUA MARSHALL, ^x Plaintiff,	3	E-mail: Judi Johnson@nyed.uscourts.gov	1
4	versus 10-CV-02714 (JBW)	4		
5	THE CITY OF NEW YORK, Defendant. United States Courthouse	5	Proceedings recorded by computerized stenography, produced by Computer-aided Transcription.	Transcr
6	THE CITY OF NEW YORK, Defendant. Brooklyn, New York	6	produced by Computer-added Transcriptions	
7		7		
8	9:30 A.M.	8		
9	***VOLUME II**	9		
10	"CONTINUED TRANSCRIPT OF TRIAL	10		
11	CONTINUED TRANSCRIPT OF TRIAL UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE ^{IN} .	11		
12	ADDEADANCES.	12		
13	FOR THE PLAINTIFF:	13		
14		14		
15	COHEN & FITCH LLP Attorneys for the Plaintiff	15		
16	Woodworth Building 233 Broadway - Sune 1801 New York 19279	16		
17	New York, New York 10219	17		
18	BY: GERALD M. COHEN, ESQ. JON NORINSBERG, ESQ.	18		
19	JOH HORINSBERG, ESQ.	19		
20		20		
21	For the Defendants:	21		
22	NEW YORK CITY LAW DEPAR	PATE	h.s.	
23	Afforney for the Defendant 110 Course Street New York, New York 10007	23		
24		24		
25	BY; FELICIA GROSS, ESQ.	25		
	JUDI JOHNSON, RPR, CRR, CLR- Official Court Ref	orter	JUDI JOHNSON, RPR, CRR, CLR - Ometal Co	ouer Rep

	PROCEEDINGS 3		
1	(In open court.)	1	
2	COURTROOM DEPUTY: All rise. The United S	ta h rs	th
3	District Court for the Eastern District of New York is now is	3	ор
4	session. The Honorable JACK B. WEINSTEIN is now presi	dirig.	th
5	(Honorable JACK B. WEINSTEIN takes the bench	.) 5	
6	COURTROOM DEPUTY: Calling civil trial proc	ecdin	g i h
7	in Docket no. 10-CV-2714, Joshua Marshall against The City	07	co
8	New York	8	a
9	THE COURT: Marshall v. Randall and Burbridg	e, 9	As
10	I have the defendants' brief in support of multiple	10	Co
11	trial motions,	11	th
12	MR. COHEN: Your Honor, may I step outside jus	(13	pl
13	get my co-counsel?	13	
14	THE COURT: If he's here,	14	th
15	MR. COHEN: He's here.	15	
16	MS. CASTRO: Your Honor, 1 will step out and ge	t 16y	cr
17	co-counsel as well.	17	inj
18	(A brief pause.)	18	ch
19	THE COURT: I've gone over this brief in support	o F 9	
20	the defendants' multiple trial motions. Thank you very muc	n 20	clo
21	for getting this in early. It was helpful to be able to read	21	ru
22	it early this morning.	22	re
23	I'll briefly summarize the conclusions I have and	23	
24	changes I'm making, and then if it's necessary, we can have	24	im
25	further argument.	25	co

PROCEEDINGS

Defendants asked to be permitted to cross-examine he plaintiff as to his criminal history now that he has pened the door to such testimony. I don't think he's opened he door. That is denied.

Second, plaintiff has improperly made an issue of he legal validity of the officers' initial approach in ontravention of the Court's prior order. Defendants request curative instruction and, in the alternative, a mistrial. is I explained yesterday, there was no contravention of the Court's prior order. The testimony was properly limited to ne period from which the defendants had first observed the laintiff to the time of arrest.

Defendants asked for a mistrial, which is denied on e merits.

Third, defendants should be permitted to ross-examine plaintiff as to his emotional and psychological juries. He's not seeking damages. And I'll modify the harge, as I'll explain in a moment, to make that clear.

Fourth, defendants should be permitted to mention in losing that the criminal case was dismissed on Speedy Trial ules. I've already dealt with that, and I see no reason to copen that. It's been discussed repeatedly.

Defendants request a curative instruction as to the nport of the grand jury's indictment. That's five, and it's ombined really with six. Instruction of a presumption of JUDI JOHNSON, RPR, CRR, CLR - Official Court Reporter

JUDI JOHNSON, RPR, CRR, CLR - Official Court Reporter

Case: 12-2479 Document: 40-1 Page: 98 09/27/2012 731928

A1292

Case 1 10-cv-02714-JBW-VVP | Document 71-1 | Filed 04/26/12 | Page 5 of 12 PageID #, 1084

	PROCEEDINGS 137		PROCEEDINGS 138
1	MR. COHEN: I believe it's the Second Circuit.	1	Honor. If I could just have one minute. Kerman is 374 F.36
2	MR. NORINSBERG: Second Circult.	2	93. It's a Second Circuit decision from 2004. And if you
3	MR. COHEN: I have the case cite in my bag.	3	look at Pages 123 to 125, the quote is - well, what I've
4	MR. NORINSBERG: It's definitely Second Circu	1.4	quoted for is "recognizing that loss of liberty and emotional
5	MR. COHEN: I'm sure it was referenced in my m	otfon	injuries are independent of each other and"
6	in limine papers, your Honor.	6	THE COURT: Start again.
7	THE COURT: Why didn't you object to the charg	e?7	MR. COHEN: - "the tort of false arrest and
8	MR. NORINSBERG: We did. That's why we opp	o. S d	healicious prosecution are complete with even a brief restraint
9	nominal damages. If there's a deprivation of liberty in any	9	of the Plaintiff's freedom, it is not necessary that any
10	magnitude, Kerman says there has to be an award of some	10	damages result from it other than the confinement, itself."
1 I	monetary compensation.	11	That's just for the portion that states that the
12	THE COURT: You disagree?	12	loss of freedom is a compensatory damage. But I believe,
13	MS. SANDS: We disagree, your Honor.	13	later on in the case, it talks about how there must be
14	THE COURT: Have you got a case?	14	compensatory damages if a loss of liberty is found.
15	MS, SANDS: We don't have a case handy, but we	15	THE COURT: Bring in the jury.
16	certainly disagree that I know the case you just read, but	16	MS. SANDS: Your Honor, I believe that case focused
17	we feel there has to be liability before they can	17	on nominal damages, basically nominal damages if the jury
18	THE COURT: Well, of course there has to be	18	found that there was a breach of constitutional rights.
19	liability. That's not what we're talking about.	19	THE COURT: There has to be some damages.
20	MR. NORINSBERG: Your Honor, the jury might	1240	MS. SANDS: They couldn't be nominal. They would
21	asking that question: If they don't find liability, can they	21	have to be
22	still award punitive damages?	22	THE COURT: But everybody agreed to strike the
23	THE COURT: There has to be liability. What is	h23	nominal. I thought that the nominal was appropriate, but I'll
24	citation?	24	bring in the jury and tell them they have to find some
25	MR. COHEN: I'm looking for my motion papers,	y COOFE	damages.
	JUDI JOHNSON, RPR, CRR, CLR - Official Court Rep	orter	JUDI JOHNSON, RPR, CRR, CLR - Official Court Reports

	PROCEEDINGS 139		PROCEEDINGS 140
1	Bring in the jury.	1	question, "Can we give punitive awards without giving
2	(The jury entered.)	2	compensatory," theoretically, you can. You can give punitive
3	THE COURT: I want to correct what I think is in	аð	without compensatory if you found liability. Do you
4	error in the charge. As suggested in your note, Court	4	understand?
5	Exhibit 9, "Can we give punitive award without giving	5	(Jury nodding.)
6	compensatory"?	6	THE COURT: But it's hard for me to see how if you
7	First, if he was deprived of a constitutional	7	find liability and you find that he was deprived of his
8	right - that is, there is liability - that's the first	8	liberty, you cannot give him some compensatory damages. I'm
9	question. In order to give damages, there has to be	9	not telling you what to do, but it does seem to me that once
10	liability. Do you all understand that?	10	you find liability which caused a deprivation of his
11	(Jury nodding.)	11	liberty either for four and a half months or for a lesser
12	THE COURT: Anybody have any question about	ыс?	time while he was arrested, et cetera that's all
13	If there's no liability, there's no damages. Do you	13	deprivation.
14	understand that? Everybody understand that?	14	You've got to find some violation first, some
15	(Jury nodding.)	15	liability. Then, after you find liability as - if you do, as
16	THE COURT: Assuming you find liability and	'#6	I suggested, the next thing is compensatory damages. Now, if
17	not saying you should or shouldn't, do you understand? If yo	oti 7	you do find liability, it's, again, hard for me to see how you
18	find liability, and flowing from that liability as a proximate	18	cannot find some compensatory damages and he would be crititle
19	cause was deprival of the Plaintiff's liberty, either while he	19	to compensatory damages for a deprivation. Do you understand
20	was arrested in violation of his rights if you find that	20	that?
21	or for another reason in violation of his rights, he was	21	(Jury nodding.)
22	incurcerated for a substantial length of time, then he is	22	THE COURT: If the deprivation was caused by the
23	entitled to compensatory damages. Do you understand that!	23	denial. Do you understand?
24	(Jury nodding.)	24	(Jury nodding.)
25	THE COURT: How much is for you to decide. So	tB6	THE COURT: Therefore, the question of whether we
	JUDI JOHNSON, RPR, CRR, CLR - Omeial Court Ren	 orter	(

A1293

Case 1.10-cv-02714-JBW-VVP | Document 71-1 | Filed 04/26/12 | Page 6 of 12 PageID #. 1035

125 **PROCEEDINGS** prosecutor, leading to a deprivation of the plaintiff's 1 1 liberty. If a defendant presented accurate evidence to the 2 2 3 prosecutor or presented false evidence thinking it was true, 3 4 then you must find for the defendant. And I've already told you a few moments ago that what was told to the prosecutor in5 the grand jury room or in preparation is not what we're 6 7 talking about here. It's at other times. 8 Do you understand that? 8 9 (Jury nodding.) THE COURT: The third element that plaintiff must0 10 prove is that the acts of Officer Randall and officer 11 11 12 Burbridge were a proximate cause of injuries he sustained. 12 13 There can be more than one cause that's proximate. 13 14 An injury or damage is proximally caused by an ac 14 15 15 or failure to act whenever the act or omission played a 16 16 substantial part in bringing about or actually causing the injury or damage and that the injury was the direct or 17 17 18 18 reasonably probable consequence of the act or omission. 19 To recover damages, Marshall has the burden, that 19 20 20 is, the plaintiff, of proving that he suffered an injury and that the injury would not have occurred without the wrongful21 21 22 22 conduct of a defendant. 23 If you find the plaintiff has proven one of his 23 24 three claims, you are going to have to determine damages, if 24 any, that he sustained and proved. Don't infer that he had 25 JUDI JOHNSON, RPR, CRR, CLR - Official Court Reporter

damages merely because I am instructing you. It's exclusively your function to determine liability and damages.

He's seeking first compensatory damages. If liability is proven on one of the claims, you will award the plaintiff sufficient damages to compensate him for any injury proximally caused by one of the defendants' actions in creating the liability. Damages of this type is known as compensatory damages. Their purpose is to make the plaintiff whole, that is, to give back, to the extent that money can, the problem or injury that he — for the injury that he suffered. Those damages should be fair and reasonable, neither inadequate nor excessive, and they should be only for injuries the plaintiff suffered or is reasonably likely to suffer as a proximate result of an injury claimed and proved.

PROCEEDINGS

The plaintiff claims as the injury that he spent four and a half months in jail. He is not seeking recovery for any emotional or psychological injuries. He is not seeking recovery for loss of earnings. That is, for any emotional or psychological injuries that continued after the jail. He is seeking damages for the time he spent in jail.

In awarding compensatory damages, be guided by dispassionate common sense. Use such definitiveness and accuracy as the circumstances permit.

Each defendant is entitled to fair, separate and individual consideration both as to liability and as to

JUDI JOHNSON, RPR, CRR, CLR - Official Court Reporter

127 **PROCEEDINGS** damages. It's as if you were trying two separate trials at 1 the same time, 2 Is that clear to you? 3 (Jury nodding.) 4 THE COURT: If you find that only one is responsible for a particular injury, then you must impose damages, if any, 6 for that injury only upon that defendant. If you find no 8 injuries by any of the defendants, then you'll rule 9

1 2

3

4

5

6 7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Injuries by any of the defendants, then you'll rule
accordingly.

The plaintiff is also asking for punitive damages.
Should you award compensatory damages, you may award additional punitive damages if you find that a defendant engaged in extraordinary misconduct. You may do so to express your disapproval and to serve as an example or warning to others who might otherwise engage in similar conduct.

8
9
10
11
12
12
13
14
15

If you find in favor of plaintiff and against the defendant and if you finds that the defendant acted so maliciously, wantonly or oppressively as to warrant an awar of punitive damages, you may make such an award.

To justify an award of punitive damages, a defendant's misconduct must be based upon a reckless or callous disregard of the rights of the plaintiff or a gross indifference treasure them. You may also award punitive damages if a defendant acted to punish the plaintiff out of ill will or spite.

HUDI JOHNSON, RPR, CRR, CLR - Official Court Reporter

20

21

22

23

24

25

PROCEEDINGS

128

126

You may assess punitive damages or any damages against either or both of the defendants, or in the case of punitive damages, you may refuse to assess them at all.

If punitive damages are assessed against more than one defendant, the amount may be the same or may be different.

When you begin your deliberations, don't communicate with anybody outside the jury room except in writing through the marshal, who will give me the note, and then I'll communicate back or call you back into court.

You can ask for help on the law or anything else.

Be respectful to each other when you're having your discussions. Don't heaitate to change your mind after considering what other people say, but each of you is entitled to your individual vote and must exercise your individual judgment. And when the verdict comes in, you will each be asked if that is your verdict.

Don't tell me how the vote stands until you come into court. If you've reached a verdict, don't report to me what it is. You will be asked that in open court. Inform the Court in writing when you've reached a verdict without indicating what that verdict is.

You'll render your verdict without fear or without favor, without prejudice and without sympathy.

Now, these are the questions you'll have to answer.
First, did Randall falsely arrest the plaintiff?

JUDI JOHNSON, RPR, CRR, CLR - Official Court Reporter

Case: 12-2479 Document: 40-1 Page: 100 09/27/2012 731928

A1294

Case : 10-rv 02714-JBW-VVP | Document 71-1 | Filed 04/26/12 | Page 7 of 12 PageID # 1086

1

4

7

PROCEEDINGS

89

years? No one ever talked to him. This man was so unimportant that the D.A.'s office never interviewed him, let alone him testifying in front of a grand jury. And this guy, he comes in here. What's the one thing, the one undisputed fact we get out of him? He didn't see who threw the gun. 11 5 did not see who threw the gun. That's the number one fact, and with good reason.

1

2

3

6

7

8

10

11 12

13

14

15

16

17 18

19 20

21

22

23

24

25

1

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

The man's driving the wrong way down a one-way street at night in an area where you have several stores that 10 are open 24 hours, and of course he's paying attention to what's ahead of him. He's not looking. What did he actually 11 remember? This man said he did thousands of arrests, over at 2 thousand in his career. And yet, four years later, he's 13 contacted for the first time. And wouldn't you know it, he 14 just remembers in great detail this particular case. Of 15 course, it comes out that his memory was somewhat refreshed 16 when he was able to meet with the lawyers from the Defendants in this case. 18

19 And we're seeing what happens here. We saw an example with Officer Burbridge. Remember, I questioned him) yesterday about this. During his deposition, Officer 21 Burbridge couldn't think of the right answer. We had a bres 22 and all of a sudden, the answers came flowing. We saw how 23 Officer Randall was only too happy to adopt the term, his 24 "associate." He started using that in his direct after hearing 25

JUDI JOHNSON, RIPR, CRR, CLR - Official Court Reporter

PROCEEDINGS

90

it from the lawyer. My point is this: How real is that testimony? It's four years after the fact meeting with their lawyers. And at the end of the day, it really doesn't change any of the dynamics in this case at all.

The one part, I don't know if you believe it, I don't think this guy actually saw anything. Even if you believed his story they saw Meade's hands, that just would make perfect sense to this whole story of what happened. Mende is going along. He's the one that tosses the gun. He's the one worried about the cops. Officers, look, I got nothing here. What normal person would walk down the street, and when police are coming, would go like this? That doesn't make sense. He's doing it because he's got the guilty conscience. He knows he just tossed that gun. He wants to make sure the officers think it's not him. And guess what? It worked. It worked.

The bottom line is this, ladies and gentlemen. You questions are going to come down to what they call a verdict sheet. I'm just going to walk through this very briefly with you. You'll get it again. You're going to have copies of it. You'll have a chance to go through this extensively. Essentially, there are three main questions: Was Mr. Marshall falsely arrested by these two Defendants; was he maliciously prosecuted; was he denied a right to a fair trial by the false evidence?

JUDI JOHNSON, RPR, CRR, CLR - Official Court Reporter

PROCEEDINGS

1

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

13

14

145

16

17

18

19

20

24

25

Now, I suggest to you all of those questions turn on the very first thing that we talked about when I started my closing argument today: Did Marshall have a gun on him? If 3 Marshall did not have gun on him, if the answer to that question is no, he did not have a gun, then the answer to all of the questions on the verdict sheet is yes. Now, if Marshall actually had the gun, if you still believe that after everything you've heard, then of course, he's not entitled to anything. You throw him out. That's your lob as lurors.

But if you actually think through this and believe that these officers gave false information to the prosecutors, they duped the prosecutors because the prosecutors weren't 012 on the street. They duped it and put it over on the grand jury with these false stories. If you believe that's what happened, then the Marshall to not having a gun, the answer all the answers on the verdict sheet is yes. It's yes.

And then, you'll see there's a question. When they're talking about maliciously prosecuting, just so you understand, our view is simply this: They're feeding false information. They may not be the prosecutors, per se, but they're feeding that information. Now, one thing on the first 21 two questions on false arrest. Let's say some of you -- and I know there's room for a healthy discussion about all this case 23 and the facts. It's not like the attorneys --

MS. CASTRO: Objection.

JUDI JOHNSON, RPR. CRR. CLR - Official Court Reporter

PROCEEDINGS

THE COURT: You may continue your argument. MR. NORINSBERG: -- defense counsel got up in your opening and said this is just an open-and-shut case. We actually want you to think about it. When you think about it, let's say some of you still are not sure. You don't know where you are. The first questions, the first two questions on false arrest, the Defendants actually have the burden of proof on those questions. You'll hear that from the judge. They have the hurden to prove that they had grounds to arrest Marshall, not us. We have the burden on the other two claims. But on those first two questions, for some of you, if you're not comfortable with that, they have the burden. If they fail to meet their burden, they lose on that claim.

Now, you'll see the sections on compensatory damages, I don't even want to touch that with you. I want this case -- I don't want to taint this about this case being a money case. This is about holding these officers accountable. Whatever value you put on it is fine. It's about showing that you were not fooled like these other people. You weren't mislead like the grand jury. You see the light here. You understand what happened.

But there's one section, the last section on punitive damages, that I do want you to take very seriously. Punitive damages gives you an opportunity to speak your voice and actually be heard as a juror. You can send a message to

JUDI JOHNSON, RPR, CRR, CLR - Official Court Reporter

Case: 12-2479 Document: 40-1 Page: 101 09/27/2012 731928 126

A1295

Case 1:10-cv-62714-JBW-VVP | Document 71-1 | Filed 04/26/12 | Page 8 of 12 PageID #, 1087

	PROCEEDINGS 93		PROCEEDINGS 94
i	these two Defendants.	1	a quarter after one. Don't discuss the case.
2	MS, CASTRO: Objection.	2	(The jury exited.)
3	MR. NORINSBERG: You can send a message.	3	THE COURT: You have the jury charge with all the
4	THE COURT: You may continue your argument.	4	corrections. And we've run off copies for the jury later.
5	MR. NORINSBERG: You can send a message thr	ough	Nonjoy your lunch. I'll see you at 1:15.
6	verdict, not just to these two Defendants, but to any other	6	(A lunch recess was taken.)
7	police officer out there that thinks it's okay to get in front	7	(Continued on the next page.)
8	of a grand jury and lie. You can send a message to any	В	
9	other police officer out there that thinks it's okay.	9	
10	THE COURT: Strike that reference to before the	10	
11	grand jury.	11	
12	MR NORINSBERG: You can send a message to	inķ2ot	her
13	police officer that thinks it's okay to tell a prosecutor	13	
14	something that's completely false, and say, you know what, y	on 4	
15	can't do that. You actually cannot do that in our system.	15	
16	You will be accountable. And that's what we're going to ask	16	
17	you to do at the end of the day is listen to all of the	17	
18	evidence, work through it carefully. But if you do that and	18	
19	you honor the pledges you made in your jury selection, you'r	r 19	
20	going to get the right result, and that's to hold these two	20	
21	Defendants responsible for putting this man in jail for four	21	
22	and a half months. Thank you.	22	
23	THE COURT: Thank you. Lunch will be up at 13	:30.	
24	Do you want to take a break now, and then get back here at	1	
25	about quarter after one, take a break now? We'll continue a	ŧ 25	
	JUDI JOHNSON, RPR, CRR, CLR - Official Court Rep	forter	JUDI JOHNSON, RPR, CRR, CLR - Official Court Reported

PROCEEDINGS 95 1 1 2 (Honorable Jack B. Weinstein takes the bench.) 2 3 (Jury is in the courtroom at 1:20 p.m.) 3 4 THE COURT: Be seated, please. Proceed. 4 CLOSING STATEMENT BY THE DEFENSE 5 5 6 MS. CASTRO: Good afternoon, ladies and gentlemen. 7 JURORS: Good afternoon. 8 MS. CASTRO: I want to start off by thanking you for 9 your careful attention that you paid throughout the course of 9 10 this trial. On behalf of my client, Police Officers Michael 10 11 Burbridge and Salim Randall, as well as my co-counsel, we 11 12 would like to thank you for the careful attention that you 12 13 will also give to your deliberations in deciding this case. 13 14 Now, I do have some remarks that I want to go 14 15 through and discuss our case, but I want to start off by 15 16 addressing some of the points that were made by plaintiff's 16 17 counsel in his summation a little while ago. 17 18 Now, first off, with respect to Officer Randall, 18 plaintiff's counsel started off by trying to attack his 19 19 20 credibility. He wanted you to believe that he's not a 20 21 credible witness and he gave you a few reasons for that. On 21 22 of the first reasons he gave you is because he says that there 22 23 are inconsistencies in his testimony. 23 Now, as plaintiff's counsel went through and told 24 24

you repeatedly, this happened four years ago. Four years ago 25

MARY AGNES DRURY, RPR - Official Court Reporter

25

is a long time to remember every single detail of what occurred. However, the evidence has shown that Officer Randall is consistent in the important facts of this case. He knows what he saw and he knows what he heard. He knows that he saw the plaintiff pull an object out of his waistband, make a pitching motion, and he tossed it. He knows that he heard the sound of the metal cling on the ground. He said that that is the most unmistakable sound that he knows for a fact that that's the sound of a gun hitting the ground. He's been consistent throughout his testimony in saying that.

96

Now, the second reason he wants to attack Officer Randall's credibility is because of his paperwork, his arrest paperwork, to be specific. And he spent a lot of time harping on the detail section of the arrest report. He wants you to believe that that section was left blank, that was his word, that was counsel's word, that he left that section blank, that he didn't put any information about what happened.

Now, he didn't show you that paperwork during summation, but it was admitted into evidence and you're going to have a chance to review it. Now, that arrest report is Plaintiff's Exhibit 6. And the detail section, if you look at it, says at TPO, which is time, place of occurrence, above defendant named Joshua Marshall was found in the possession of a loaded firearm, and it even specifies a serial number.

That's not blank. That's a play on his words. And it's a

MARY AGNES DRURY, RPR - Official Court Reporter

Case: 12-2479 Document: 40-1 Page: 102 09/27/2012

A1296

Case 1.10-cv-02714-JBW-VVP | Document 71-1 | Filed 04/26/12 | Page 9 of 12 PageID # 1088

PROCEEDINGS "ANSWER: That is correct," 1 1 2 2 Well, what part of that is unclear? He was asked point blank whether he ever saw it in his physical possession, 3 and he said no. He agreed it was correct. Now, if he never 4 5 saw this object in the physical possession of Mr. Marshall, 6 why did he swear under oath to a grand jury that he did see 7 it? I mean, those two stories aren't true; either you saw it, 8 or you didn't. Why did he tell the district attorney that he saw this gun in the actual possession of Mr. Marshall? 9 10 He said those things. And then, he changes his 10 Π 11 testimony during the course of these proceedings. It's dishonest. The truth came out at his deposition. He never 12 12 actually saw the possession. How else do we know that? Think3 13 about some of the statements that he made to other people. 14 14 15 Remember, folks, when I was asking him, I said, "Did you millo a statement to another prosecuting attorney that you never ships 16 17 17 him in possession of a gun?" "What, who, what prosecuting attorney? Who are vot 18 19 talking of?" 19 20 I said, "The prosecutor, Judy Phillips; did you maile20 21 a statement to her? Didn't you tell Ms. Phillips that you did not see that gun in his possession? Didn't you tell her 22 22 23 that?" 23 "I never said that." 24 24 25 Then, I show him a document. And I said, "Sir, doc 25.

74 PROCEEDINGS that refresh your memory that you told Ms. Phillips that you never saw this gun in his possession?"

"No, it doesn't refresh my memory. I never said that."

Well, of course, he can't admit saying it. If he admits he told prosecutor number two that he didn't see the gun in Marshall's possession, then what he told prosecutor number one was a lie. What he told the grand jury was a lie. So he can't admit that he made that statement.

And then, I asked him, I said, "Sir, didn't you also make a statement to the gun enhancement unit, your fellow colleagues at the NYPD? Didn't you tell them you didn't see this gun in his possession?"

"I never said that."

1 said, "Well, that's funny. That's not what you said at your deposition."

At your deposition, you said, "Actually, it's possible I did say that. I can't really remember."

Now, how is it possible, if he's saying these things now, he comes in here and he says that Marshall was in possession of a gun, and yet, at his deposition, he said that he wasn't. He tells this prosecutor, the second prosecutor, he wasn't. And he tells the gun enhancement unit he wasn't Three different times, he said he wasn't. But you're supposed to believe, the one time that he told the first D.A., that

JUDI JOHNSON, RPR, CRR, CLR - Official Court Reporter

PROCEEDINGS

75

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

17

18

19

20

22

23

JUDI JOHNSON, RPR, CRR, CLR - Official Court Reporter

that's the true statement.

1

2

3

4

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

This whole case, it's about credibility. Your job - I told you this in opening statement -- it requires the highest level of concentration to put together the pieces. This isn't going to be easy. You have to work through this evidence logically, think about these things. Why something on such a critical fact, how does that change over time?

What's the next thing that he says? The next thing he tells you, he tells you that he saw Marshall pull out the gun. He saw him pull out the object from his waist. That's funny. That's not what you said at your deposition, Officer. At your deposition, you said you didn't see any object pulled out of his waist.

And again, don't rely on what I'm telling you. Let's look at the actual evidence. This is on Page 33 of this man's deposition under oath. "QUESTION: The object that you saw him pull out of his pants?

"ANSWER: I didn't see the object as he pulled it out of his pants."

So if you didn't see the object as he pulled it out of his pants, why did you tell the grand jury under oath that 21 you saw him pull a firearm out of his pants? That's a lie. He lied. Now, you folks have the power. You can just look the other way. And you can let him say it doesn't matter, 24 these things happen, or you can hold him accountable. He's in 25

JUDIJOHNSON, RPR, CRR, CLR - Official Court Reporter

PROCEEDINGS

76

a court of law. What he told that grand jury is a lie. And the truth only came out when we started this civil lawsuit under oath.

What's the next thing he says? He says he actually saw with his own eyes -- he's certain about this, too, there's no mistake. He saw Marshall actually toss the gun away. Sure you did, Officer, just like you saw Mr. Marshall's eyes bulging from 150 feet away across the street in the dark, right? Let's think shout it. What actually did this man see? He's sitting in the back seat of a car. He's got a driver in front of him, he's got a passenger in front of him. He's up to 25 feet away. And Marshall's back is towards him. How exactly is he seeing this?

Of course, it doesn't make sense. That's why they have to change the story ever so slightly. The story is changed so that there's an angle and Marshall kind of twists Does that make sense? He's going to twist. Marshall's trying to throw the gun away and hide it because he sees the police coming. But here, Officer, look what I have, a gun. I'm throwing it into the street. Does that make sense? You have to use your common sense here. So much of this case is thinking through the evidence and using logic and deductive reasoning to work through it and figure out what's true and what's not true. His whole story doesn't make sense.

But what's even more telling, look at the paperwork. JUDI JOHNSON, RPR, CRR, CLR - Official Court Reporter A1297

Case 1:10-cv-02714-JBW-VVP | Document 71-1 | Filed 04/26/12 | Page 10 of 12 PageID #: 1089

PROCEEDINGS This man's the arresting officer. Now, he said at his 1 1 deposition he has no idea why he's the arresting officer. To 2 2 this day, he had no idea. But he's the arresting officer. 3 3 4 Look at his arrest paperwork. He gives a version, he fills out the form. There's a section on the form that actually is 5 6 a box called "DETAILS." I said, "Officer, you agree that the 6 7 7 detail of pulling out the gun in the waist; that's an important fact?" 8 write it." R And he agreed, "Yes, that's important." 9 q 10 "In fact, it's very important, right?" 10 "Yes, it's very important." 11 11 "But why isn't it anywhere in your report?" 12 12 Now, in his deposition, he said "no particular 13 1.3 14 reason," but now he came into you, because he has to explain 14 it. It's going to look foolish, right? How is he going to 15 15 16 explain this? He explains, "Actually, we don't really fill 16 out that section. You know, we just kind of pass it on to the 17 17 18 18 D.A." 19 Really? Then why is there a section that says 19 20 "DETAILS" in large, capital letters? Why is it on the police 20 report if you don't fill it out? These are the most important 21 details in. 21 details of the entire case, that you saw him pull out the gun 22 22 23 23 and toss it. And you didn't put that on your report? 24 I'll tell you why he didn't put it on the report, 24

PROCEEDINGS

78

They hadn't quite come up with exactly how they were going to present this story. He didn't have those details. So that section of the report's blank. I asked him also, "What abou the complaint report? You didn't mention anything on the complaint report, did you?"

"Hey, don't blame me. That's not my complaint report. You know, we all worked on that together. I didn't

Actually, you did write it. That's what you said in your deposition. I said, "Who prepared this report?"

"I did." He prepared the complaint report. Then, he starts telling me, "Well, you see, it's so busy. We have all these documents we have to fill out and all these reports. We all have to help each other out."

Really? What other documents? We've seen these documents generated; an arrest report, complaint report and memo book entry. It's not like they didn't have enough time The man got six hours of overtime. He filled out a report. He just doesn't want to own it because it makes him look had because there's no explanation for why he didn't have those

But my personal favorite, the best one, was the last one in the memo book entry. Does anyone here remember what this man said at his deposition? He said he didn't know what a memo book entry was for. This is an officer who's been on

JUDI JOHNSON, RPR, CRR, CLR - Omeial Court Reporter

PROCEEDINGS

because at that point in time, he didn't have the details.

JUDI JOHNSON, RPR, CRR, CLR - Official Court Reporter

25

1

5

6

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16 17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

5

9

the force for eight years. Eight years, testifying under oath in a deposition that he doesn't know what he's supposed to do 2 with a memo book. Come on, are you folks buying this? Are 3 you going to buy this? There's no way this man is telling the 4 truth in this case. It's one false, phony, dishonest claim after another.

You can just look the other way and let it go if you 7 want, or you can hold him accountable. In our system, when 8 you testify under oath, it's serious business. This isn't 10 just playing fast and loose with the facts, change the story if you don't like your answer last year at the deposition. 11 Just come in here. The jury won't know. They weren't there.12 Come on, you folks know this. This is not right what he did. 13

And you go beyond and you look at the other witness 14 that we heard from, Officer Burbridge. Do you realize that 15 this man told two completely different stories? When he 16 appeared before the grand jury, one story. When he appeared 7 in the civil lawsuit, another story. 18

Let's look at story number one. This is what he was 19 telling to the grand jury. He testified under oath in front 20 of that grand jury that what happened was he had this 21 conversation with Marshall that he said, "Sir, can I talk to 22 you for a minute?" And then, what he did was he stepped a 4123 of his car in front of Marshall, and that's when Marshall 24 threw the gun. 25

JUDI JOHNSON, RPR, CRR, CLR - Official Court Reporter

PROCEEDINGS

So what he was selling to that grand jury, he was trying to make it sound like, man, I had this guy in my line of vision. He's standing there right in front of me. I saw the whole thing. Then, all of a sudden, actually, come to think of it, I wasn't standing in front of him on the sidewalk. That never happened. Actually, come to think of it, I was inside of a car 10 feet away still inside the car when he threw the gun.

Well, which is it? First, this isn't a game you can play with somebody's liberty and make up stories. How could a story change so dramatically? This man's not taking this at all seriously, understanding that when he testified in front of the grand jury, he's under oath to tell the truth.

And his paperwork is also an illustration of how the false and dishonest claims come in. Remember his form he filled out, his stop-and-frisk form? That form, he said, "I observed furtive movements before we made the stop." Actually, that's not what you said in your deposition. At your deposition, you said you didn't observe anything suspicious.

And here's what he said, Page 66: "QUESTION: Did you observe any furtive movements by Joshua Marshall before you decided to stop him?

"ANSWER: No."

So if the answer to that is no, why did you lie in

JUDI JOHNSON, RPR, CRR, CLR - Official Court Reporter

Case: 12-2479 Document: 40-1 Page: 104 09/27/2012 731928 126

A1298

Casc 1.10-cv-02714-JBW-VVP | Document 71-1 | Filed 04/26/12 | Page 11 of 12 PageiD # 1090

	PROCEEDINGS 93		PROCEEDINGS 94
1	these two Defendants.	1	a quarter after one. Don't discuss the case.
2	MS. CASTRO: Objection.	2	(The jury exited.)
3	MR. NORINSBERG: You can send a message.	3	THE COURT: You have the Jury charge with all
4	THE COURT: You may continue your argumen	t. 4	corrections. And we've run off copies for the jury later.
5	MR. NORINSBERG: You can send a message t	mough	Jönjoy your lunch. I'll see you at 1:15.
6	verdict, not just to these two Defendants, but to any other	6	(A lunch recess was taken.)
7	police officer out there that thinks it's okay to get in front	7	(Continued on the next page.)
8	of a grand jury and lie. You can send a message to any	8	
9	other police officer out there that thinks it's okay.	9	
10	THE COURT: Strike that reference to before th	e 10	
11	grand jury.	11	
12	MR. NORINSBERG: You can send a message to	nh20	her
13	police officer that thinks it's okay to tell a prosecutor	13	
14	something that's completely false, and say, you know what,	you4	
15	can't do that. You actually cannot do that in our system.	15	
16	You will be accountable. And that's what we're going to a	sk 16	
17	you to do at the end of the day is listen to all of the	17	
18	evidence, work through it carefully. But if you do that and	[18]	
19	you honor the pledges you made in your jury selection, you	'uc 19	
20	going to get the right result, and that's to hold these two	21)	
21	Defendants responsible for putting this man in jail for fou-	- 21	
22	and a half months. Thank you.	22	
23	THE COURT: Thank you. Lunch will be up at	12:30.	
24	Do you want to take a break now, and then get back here a	t 24	
25	about quarter after one, take a break now? We'll continue	#t25	
	JUDI JOHNSON, RPR, CRR, CLR - Official Court R	eporter	JUDI JOHNSON, RPR, CRR, CLR - Official Court Rep

1 (Honorable Jack B. Weinstein takes the bench.) 2 3 (Jury is in the courtroom at 1:20 p.m.) 3 4 THE COURT: Be seated, please. Proceed. 4
3 (Jury is in the courtroom at 1:20 p.m.)
Carly to the second at the print,
4 THE COURT: Be sented, please, Proceed. 4
The country by the control of the country of the co
5 CLOSING STATEMENT BY THE DEFENSE 5
6 MS. CASTRO: Good afternoon, ladies and gentle indi
7 JURORS: Good afternoon. 7
8 MS. CASTRO: I want to start off by thanking you fa
9 your careful attention that you paid throughout the course of 9
10 this trial. On behalf of my client, Police Officers Michael 10
11 Burbridge and Salim Randall, as well as my co-counsel, we 11
12 would like to thank you for the careful attention that you 12
13 will also give to your deliberations in deciding this case. 13
Now, I do have some remarks that I want to go [4]
15 through and discuss our case, but I want to start off by 15
16 addressing some of the points that were made by plaintiff's 16
17 counsel in his summation a little while ago. 17
18 Now, first off, with respect to Officer Rundall, 18
19 plaintiff's counsel started off by trying to attack his 19
20 credibility. He wanted you to believe that he's not a 20
21 credible witness and he gave you a few reasons for that. ()nr 21
22 of the first reasons he gave you is because he says that there 22
23 are inconsistencies in his testimony. 23
Now, as plaintiff's counsel went through and told 24
25 you repeatedly, this happened four years ago. Four years ago25
MARY AGNES DRURY, RPR - Official Court Reporter

is a long time to remember every single detail of what occurred. However, the evidence has shown that Officer Randall is consistent in the important facts of this case. He knows what he saw and he knows what he heard. He knows that he saw the plaintiff pull an object out of his waistband, make a pitching motion, and he tossed it. He knows that he heard the sound of the metal cling on the ground. He said that that is the most unmistakable sound that he knows for a fact that that's the sound of a gun hitting the ground. He's been consistent throughout his testimony in saying that.

96

Now, the second reason he wants to attack Officer Randall's credibility is because of his paperwork, his arrest paperwork, to be specific. And he spent a lot of time harping on the detail section of the arrest report. He wants you to believe that that section was left blank, that was his word, that was counsel's word, that he left that section blank, that he didn't put any information about what happened.

Now, he didn't show you that paperwork during summation, but it was admitted into evidence and you're going to have a chance to review it. Now, that arrest report is Plaintiff's Exhibit 6. And the detail section, if you look at it, says at TPO, which is time, place of occurrence, above defendant named Joshua Marshall was found in the possession of a loaded firearm, and it even specifies a serial number.

That's not blank. That's a play on his words. And it's a

Case: 12-2479 Document: 40-1 Page: 105 09/27/2012 731928 126

A1299

Clar 1:10-cv-02714-JBW-VVP | Document 71-1 | Filed 04/26/12 | Page 12 of 12 PageID #. 1091

	PROCEEDINGS 129		PROCEEDINGS 130
1	Yes or no.	1	MS. SANDS: Your Honor
2	Did Officer Burbridge falsely arrest the plaintiff?	2	THE COURT: Do you wish to see me at the side bur?
3	Yes or no.	3	MS. SANDS: 1 do.
4	Did Officer Randall maliciously prosecute the	4	THE COURT; Come to the side bar,
5	plaintiff? Yes or no.	5	(At the bench.)
6	Did Officer Burbridge maliciously prosecute the	6	MS. SANDS: Your Honor, I think you misread the
7	plaintiff? Yes or no.	7	question 3A.
8	Did Officer Randall violate the plaintiff's	8	THE COURT: You're turning to page?
9	constitutional right to a fair trial by knowingly presenting	9	MS. SANDS: Page 13, question 3A.
10	false evidence to the prosecutor? I'm sorry, in preparation	10	(In open court.)
11	for the grand jury.	11	THE COURT: 3A on Page 13 reads: Did Officer
12	Did officer Burbridge violate plaintiff's	12	Randall violate plaintiff's constitutional right to a fair
13	constitutional right to a fair trial by knowingly presenting	13	trial by knowingly presenting false evidence to the prosecutor
14	false evidence to the prosecutor under similar circumstances	?14	under the circumstances I described? Yes or no.
15	If your answers to all those questions is no, you	15	MS. SANDS: Okay.
16	don't have to answer any of the following questions because	16	THE COURT: No other objections are made.
17	there won't be any damages to assess. If you find that a	17	Swear the marshal, please.
18	defendant is or has violated a right, then you'll determine	18	THE CLERK: Do you swear or affirm that you will
19	compensatory damages first attributable to Officer Burbrid	get 9	keep the jurors sworn in this cause together in some private
20	second, attributable to Officer Randall. Then, if you find	20	and convenient place, that you shall suffer no one to speak to
21	punitive damages, how much against Officer Burbridge -	21	them nor shall you speak to them unless it be at the direction
22	Officer Randall, rather, and then against Officer Burbridge	. 22	of the court to ask if they have agreed upon a verdict?
23	Do any attorneys wish to see me at the side bar?	23	THE MARSHAL: 1 do.
24	MR. NORINSBERG: No. your Honor.	24	THE COURT: Thank you.
25	MS. CASTRO: No, your Honor.	25	Continue your deliberations until I tell you to
	JUDI JOHNSON, KPR, CRR, CLR - Official Court Res	l orter	JUDI JOHNSON, RPR, CRR, CLR - Official Court Report

	PROCEEDINGS 131		PROCEEDINGS 132
1	stop. Now, if you want to go beyond 4:30 p.m., send in a	1	the list, please. Gather all of the exhibits. Nothing is to
2	note.	2	go in until I go through it.
3	(The jury exited.)	3	MR. COHEN: You have all the exhibits that we put
4	THE COURT: The instructions I read from, which	n we	in.
5	just distributed, is Court Exhibit 2, 1 think, of today's	5	THE COURT: Make up your list and put it all
6	date. The brief is marked 1, and this jury charge I gave is	6	together.
7	marked Exhibit 2.	7	I should say I appreciate the cooperation and fine
8	(Court Exhibit 1 was received in evidence, as of	8	professional lawyering of both sides.
9	this date.)	9	MS. GROSS: Thank you, your Honor.
10	(Court Exhibit 2 was received in evidence, as of	10	MR. COHEN: Thank you, your Honor.
11	this date.)	11	If I can make one request. Once the jury does have
12	THE COURT: And we have prior drafts. There i	e is a	a verdict, we would like to speak to them.
13	April 24th draft, which is marked Exhibit 3.	13	THE COURT: You're free to do so. It's up to the n
14	(Court Exhibit 3 was received in evidence, as of	14	whether they want to talk to you.
15	this date.)	15	MR. COHEN: Can you just ask them if they want to
16	THE COURT: There's an April 20th draft which	isi 6	stick around, to let them know that the attorneys would like
17	marked 4.	17	to
18	(Court Exhibit 4 was received in evidence, as of	18	THE COURT: I will tell them. Yes, I will do that
19	this date.)	19	MS. GROSS: Defendants join in that request.
20	THE COURT: And there's an April 17th draft, w	h 🖟	THE COURT: I will do that.
21	is marked 5.	21	(Recess.)
22	(Court Exhibit 5 in evidence, was received as of	22	THE COURT: Yes, what can I do to help you?
23	this date.)	23	MS. CASTRO: We've gathered all of the exhibits and
24	THE COURT: Do you have a list of the witnesses,	24	created a witness list.
25	please? Do you have a list of the exhibits, please? Make up	25	THE COURT: May I see the witness list, please.
	JUDI JOHNSON, RPR, CRR, CLR - Official Court Rep		JUDI JOHNSON, RPR, CRR, CLR - Official Confr Reports

PROCEEDING	S 132
the list, please. Gather all of the e	xhibits. Nothing is to
go in until I go through it.	
MR. COHEN: You have	all the exhibits that we put
in.	
THE COURT: Make up	your list and put it all
together.	
I should say I appreciate	the cooperation and fine
professional lawyering of both side	:5,
MS. GROSS: Thank you	ı, your Honor.
MR. COHEN: Thank yo	ou, your Honor.
If I can make one request	. Once the jury does have
a verdict, we would like to speak to	them.
THE COURT: You're for	ree to do so. It's up to the n
whether they want to talk to you.	
MR. COHEN: Can you	just ask them if they want to
stick around, to let them know tha	t the attorneys would like
to	
THE COURT; I will tell	them. Yes, I will do that
MS. GROSS: Defendant	ts join in that request.
THE COURT: I will do	that.
(Recess.)	
THE COURT: Yes, wha	t can I do to help you?
	athered all of the exhibits an
created a witness list.	
THE COURT: May I se	e the witness list, please.
•	

Case: 12-2479 Document: 40-1 Page: 106 09/27/2012 731928 126

A1300

TRIAL TRANSCRIPT, DATED APRIL 26, 2012 (pp. A1300-A1325)

REPRODUCED FOLLOWING

A1301

	390
UNITED STATES DISTRICT CO	YORK
JOSHUA MARSHALL, Plaintiff	
versus	10-CV-02714 (JBW)
THE CITY OF NEW YORK, Defendant	Brooklyn, New York
	April 26, 2012 11:30 A.M.
*	***VOLUME III**
	ED TRANSCRIPT OF TRIAL
	HON. JACK B. WEINSTEIN, STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
A P FOR THE PLAINTIFF:	PEARANCES:
	COHEN & FITCH, LLP
	Attorneys for the Plaintiff Woolworth Building
	233 Broadway - Suite 1800
	New York, New York 10279
	BY: GERALD M. COHEN, ESQ.
	JON NORINSBERG, ESQ.
For the Defendants:	
	NEW YORK CITY LAW DEPARTMENT
	Attorney for the Defendant 100 Church Street
	New York, New York 10007
	BY: FELICIA GROSS, ESQ. JOHANA CASTRO, ESQ. FRANCES SANDS. ESO.

Case: 12-2479 Document: 40-1 Page: 108 09/27/2012 731928 126

A1302

PROCEEDINGS Court Reporter: Judi Johnson, RPR, CRR, CLR Official Court Reporter Telephone: (718) 613-2582 Facsimile: (718) 613-2480 E-mail: Judi Johnson@nyed.uscourts.gov Proceedings recorded by computerized stenography. Transcript produced by Computer-aided Transcription.

	PROCEEDINGS 392
1	(In open court.)
2	COURTROOM DEPUTY: All rise. The United States
3	District Court for the Eastern District of New York is now is
4	session. The Honorable JACK B. WEINSTEIN is now presiding.
5	(Honorable JACK B. WEINSTEIN takes the bench.)
6	COURTROOM DEPUTY: Calling civil trial proceedings
7	in Docket no. 10-CV-2714, Joshua Marshall against The City of
8	New York.
9	THE COURT: The jury is here?
10	THE CLERK: Yes, Judge.
11	THE COURT: Tell them to deliberate.
12	We have a motion from the defendants. I'll be happy
13	to hear you.
1 4	File the memorandum with Exhibits A and B that was
15	furnished this morning to the Court and I assume to opposing
16	counsel.
17	MR. NORINSBERG: Yes, your Honor.
18	MS. GROSS: Good morning, your Honor.
19	The defendants for light of what we believe to be
20	the extensive and pervasive nature of the prejudice on several
21	grounds.
22	First, we believe that the jury now has an incorrect
23	instruction with respect to the relationship between
24	compensatory and punitive damages. We believe that under the
25	Kurman Robinson and State Farm cases, it's an incorrect

Case: 12-2479 Document: 40-1 Page: 110 09/27/2012 731928 126

A1304

PROCEEDINGS

statement of law to say that they may award punitive damages in the absence of first awarding compensatory damages.

Moreover, because the Court has now given two instructions with respect to the relationship between compensatory and punitive damages, it's the defendants' position that no curative instruction may reasonably be given.

Second, it's the defendants' position that the Court misstated the law with respect to plaintiff's psychological or emotional damages. He's not seeking psychological or emotional damages. He testified as such at defendants' deposition. During the pre-charge conference, the jury charge read that the Court would instruct the jury that plaintiff claims as the injury he spent four and a half months in jail, he's not seeking any recovery for any emotional or psychological injuries, he's not seeking recovery for loss of earnings, but then during the charge the Court read he's not seeking recovery for any emotional or psychological injuries, that is, for any emotional or psychological injuries that continued after the jail. He's seeking damages from the time he spent in jail.

He is seeking damages for loss of liberty. It's our position that he has abandoned his claim of emotional or psychological injuries both with respect to time after his time of incarceration and with respect to his actual time of incarceration. A loss of liberty is a separate and

Case: 12-2479 Document: 40-1 Page: 111 09/27/2012 731928 126

A1305

PROCEEDINGS 394

independent ground upon which the Court -- the jury may award damages.

Third, plaintiff was improperly permitted to ask the jury to send a message, not just to these defendants but to all putative malfeasors. Under the law, we believe that's impermissible.

Fourth, because the defendants were precluded from introducing evidence of plaintiff's prior incarcerations, any the damage award would be speculative under the Benucci case decided by the Eastern District.

Fifth, plaintiff repeatedly and properly argued during his closing argument that defendants made misleading statements to the grand jury. Such statements would not be a proper basis of liability under the Rehberg case.

Sixth, the Court misread the jury charge with respect to defendants' potential liability for testimony before the grand jury in contravention of Rehberg. It made a clarifying statement, but we believe the confusion is irrepairable.

And finally, your Honor, defendants have not had a chance to review the transcript in great detail, but we do object insofar as we believe plaintiff's counsel referenced city lawyers in his closing argument or leading up thereto. We have not located it in the transcript.

THE COURT: Do you want me to instruct the jury on

A1306

395 PROCEEDINGS 1 that matter? I don't think it made any impression on anybody. 2 But if I now bring it to their attention or if I brought it to 3 their attention at the time, it would emphasize what nobody considered of any importance in the courtroom. 4 5 What do you wish me to do? MS. GROSS: We do not wish a curative instruction on 6 7 that point. We agree that it would draw unnecessary attention 8 to it. We do note that we do object to the fact they said it, 9 and we believe that prejudice resulted. 10 Finally, defense would request that the special 11 interrogatory sheet that was submitted be given to the jury 12 after it reaches its verdict. 13 THE COURT: Thank you very much. 14 What is the position of the plaintiffs? 15 MR. NORINSBERG: Your Honor, we believe that the 16 Court directly addressed the question that was raised by the 17 jury and really extensively explained it and made it clear to 18 the jury what the proper standard would be and that they would 19 indeed need to find liability first before they could award 20 any type of punitive damages. 21 I'm really not at all sure what else the Court could 22 have possibly said that would have clarified it any further. 23 In fact, we received a second note from the jury where they 24 explained that the Court's -- the Court's discussion of the 25 issue had removed the confusion that had been there

Case: 12-2479 Document: 40-1 Page: 113 09/27/2012 731928

A1307

396 PROCEEDINGS

beforehand. So we just don't see any issue with that at all. 1

MR. COHEN: I'll add just a little bit to that point. 3

2

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Your Honor did explain to the jury -- and I think this is where the confusion stemmed from. Because your Honor stated there was no lost wages and there were no psychological or emotional damages, the jury was a little lost at what the compensatory damages could be. And the court properly stated that loss of liberty was what was -- that the injury that the plaintiff was seeking for those compensatory damages, without telling the jury that they should be finding loss of liberty damages, you just explained to the jury what the type of injury -- that would justify a compensatory damage award.

MR. NORINSBERG: With respect to the send a message portion of my summation, which I had addressed before I did the summation, it's limited strictly to punitive damages. The nature of punitive damages is exactly that. It's to deter this conduct from occurring again in the future. It is not limited to the actual tortfeasors. The whole concept behind punitive damages is that it extends to others similarly situated to make sure that they don't engage in the same improper behavior. So I feel that that argument is really not a sound argument under the law.

To be clear, the statements that I made with regard to false and misleading statements to the grand jury, it's

	PROCEEDINGS 397
<u> </u>	very clear under the law, as it stands right now, regardless
2	of Rehberg, that there's still a presumption that is created
3	through the indictment. I believe that was expressly
4	mentioned in the charge at the request of the defendants.
5	There's a presumption that needs to be overcome. One of the
6	ways of overcoming that presumption is to indicate that, in
7	fact, the officers made false and misleading statements to the
8	grand jury and that in that context, that's what those
9	remarks were for. They also were used to establish
LO	credibility, which is the key issue in this entire case. So
1	to the extent that there are references to false testimony
. 2	that was given to the grand jury, it is for those two
1.3	purposes, to overcome the presumption, one, and two, to
14	address the general issues of credibility.
15	THE COURT: A limiting instruction was not requested
16	by defendants at that time, was it? Is that correct?
. 7	MS. GROSS: I'm not sure what the record is with
L 8	respect to that part, your Honor.
L 9	THE COURT: My recollection is there was no request
20	for a limiting instruction.
21	MR. NORINSBERG: That's my recollection as well.
22	THE COURT: However, the record will speak for
23	itself.
24	MR. NORINSBERG: Not only that, the Court's
25	charge itself

Case: 12-2479 Document: 40-1 Page: 115 09/27/2012 731928 126

A1309

PROCEEDINGS

THE COURT: Excuse me. I believe a limiting instruction at this late date would not be desirable.

1.5

MR. NORINSBERG: And the Court's instruction itself expressly states that it's not a basis for liability to say that they lied to the grand jury. It's in the charge itself. So I really don't see how there's any possibility of the jury misunderstanding that.

I just want to state on that issue for a long time police officers have enjoyed complete absolute immunity for trial testimony under Briscoe versus Lahue, which is a Supreme Court case; and for many years, in the same sense, we've been able to use us false testimony at trial for general credibility purposes even though it's not an independent basis of liability under 1983. And I don't think Rehberg changes that at all. It's the same use of testimony which otherwise would not be a basis for liability independently under 1983 but nonetheless could still be identified for credibility purposes.

THE COURT: I should add that had a request been made for a limitation, I would have so advised the jury to use that on credibility only.

MR. NORINSBERG: Lastly, with respect to the request for special interrogatories, it's absolutely inappropriate in this case. As I said during our initial charge conference on April 16th, when we first met to deal with the motions in

Case: 12-2479 Document: 40-1 Page: 116 09/27/2012 731928 126

A1310

399 PROCEEDINGS limine, there's no basis here for finding qualified immunity. 2 There's a sharp factual dispute. The issue is whether he had 3 a gun or he didn't. The officers repeatedly stated under oath at their depositions and again at trial that they were 4 5 positive they saw him with a qun. So if the jury were to find that they didn't see him with a gun, that would mean that 6 7 they're not entitled to qualified immunity. It would mean that they willfully and deliberately lied, in which case there 8 9 would be no purpose for having these further interrogatories. 10 So while there are circumstances in certain types of cases where additional interrogatories are warranted, that 12 would not be the case in this particular civil action. 13 Thank you, your Honor. 14 THE COURT: Bring in the jury, please. 15 MS. GROSS: Your Honor, may I be heard? 16 THE COURT: Yes, of course. 17 MS. GROSS: May I be heard briefly? 18 THE COURT: Yes. 19 MS. GROSS: I just wanted to emphasize the point 20 that we believe very strongly that the jury now has an 21 incorrect statement of law with respect to the relationship 22 between compensatory and punitive damages. It's our position 23 that the jury cannot award punitive damages in the absence of 24 compensatory damages under State Farm. 25 THE COURT: I understand.

Case: 12-2479 Document: 40-1 Page: 117 09/27/2012 731928 126

A1311

400 **PROCEEDINGS** MS. GROSS: Please note our objection to the Court's 1 2 rulings. 3 THE COURT: To the what? MS. GROSS: To the Court's rulings with respect to 4 5 the motion. MS. SANDS: Your Honor, I would also like to note 6 7 for the record our objection to the special interrogatories. 8 I believe under the case of Zelna v. Summerland, Second Circuit case, we are entitled to that. 9 10 MR. NORINSBERG: I just want to note for the record 11 the Court --12 THE COURT: Special interrogatories in these kinds 13 of cases are not desirable. They're confusing to the jury. 14 It's a simple case. I'm not going to, at this late stage, 15 after the matter has been fully discussed in connection with 16 the charge, introduce special interrogatories and disturb the 17 deliberations. 18 MR. NORINSBERG: Your Honor --19 THE COURT: Thank you. Bring in the jury. 20 MR. NORINSBERG: May I just be heard? 21 THE COURT: Yes. 22 MR. NORINSBERG: I just want to say the Court 23 yesterday asked counsel -- they repeatedly state they have 24 objections. The Court asked counsel what they would propose, 25 what additional language should be charged. They failed to

A1312

401 PROCEEDINGS 1 advise the Court of any special additional requests yesterday, 2 and today they haven't come in here with any type of 3 supplemental charge that they believe is appropriate to give to the jury. So the Court gave them an opportunity; they 4 5 failed to avail themselves of that. I just wanted that on the 6 record. 7 THE COURT: Thank you. Bring in the jury. MS. GROSS: Your Honor, I believe that's an 8 9 incorrect statement of what our position was yesterday. We 10 expressly said that the initial jury charge was the proper 11 one. 12 THE COURT: Thank you. (The jury entered.) 13 14 THE COURT: Be seated everyone, please. 15 I've arranged for lunch for 12:45 p.m. You can 16 deliberate right through lunch if you'd like. It won't upset 17 your digestion if you don't. You don't have to talk about it. 18 In going through the transcript this morning, I 19 noticed that it was suggested that you send a message. I 20 don't want you to send any messages. I just want you to 21 decide the case in accordance with my instructions? 22 Do you understand? 23 THE JURY: Yes. 24 THE COURT: That's enough. No messages. Just 25 decide the case.

Case: 12-2479 Document: 40-1 Page: 119 09/27/2012 731928 126

A1313

402 **PROCEEDINGS** All right, thank you. Continue deliberations, 1 2 please. 3 (The jury exited.) 4 MR. NORINSBERG: Your Honor, I just want to place 5 our objection on the record. 6 This issue had been raised this morning by defense 7 counsel, and the Court did not indicate that it was going to 8 give a supplemental charge with respect to this issue. We had 9 no opportunity to be heard or to propose language. 10 THE COURT: I would be delighted to hear your 11 objection and proposed language. 12 MR. NORINSBERG: But it's too late now. 13 THE COURT: Sit down. 14 MR. NORINSBERG: It's too late. I mean, you just 15 gave them a supplemental charge on it. 16 THE COURT: Do you wish to put something on the 17 record to show what you would have asked for? If you do, I'm 18 giving you the opportunity to do so. 19 MR. NORINSBERG: We would've asked -- if the Court 20 was inclined to give a supplemental instruction on this 21 particular issue, which we would've objected to had we known 22 the Court was going to do it, we would've asked the Court to 23 explain that, in fact, under the law with respect to punitive 24 damages and only with respect to punitive damages, it is appropriate that their verdict would be used for the purpose 25

Case: 12-2479 Document: 40-1 Page: 120 09/27/2012 731928 126

	PROCEEDINGS 403
1	of sending a message because that's the purpose of punitive
2	damages, is to deter future similar conduct. However, that
3	language would not apply to compensatory damages. That's what
4	we would have asked the Court to clarify.
5	So we feel what was just told to the jury is
6	actually not correct under the law.
7	THE COURT: The charge reads at Page 11, and I think
8	it's accurate: If you award compensatory damages, you may
9	award additional punitive damages if you find that a defendant
10	engaged in extraordinary misconduct. I elaborated and
11	corrected, if it needed corrected, the first sentence.
12	Second sentence: You may do so to express your
13	disapproval and "to serve as an example or warning to others
14	who might otherwise engage in similar conduct."
15	That sufficiently states the proposition without
16	having the jury think about messages.
17	Anything further? Let Ms. Lowe know where you can
18	be reached.
19	(Whereupon, a break was taken.)
20	THE COURT: Mark the brief as Court Exhibit 1 of
21	today.
22	(A Brief with attachment was marked as Court Exhibit
23	1 was received in evidence, as of this date.)
24	
25	(Court Exhibit 2 was received in evidence, as of

Case: 12-2479 Document: 40-1 Page: 121 09/27/2012 731928 126

```
404
                         PROCEEDINGS
 1
     this date.)
 2
               THE COURT: Court Exhibit 2.
 3
               We have reached a verdict.
               Sit down everybody, please.
 4
 5
               Madam clerk, take the verdict, please.
 6
              (The jury entered.)
 7
               THE CLERK: Will the foreperson please rise.
 8
               Did Officer Randall falsely arrest the plaintiff on
 9
     May 15th, 2008? Yes or no.
10
               THE FOREPERSON: Yes.
11
               THE CLERK: Did Officer Burbridge falsely arrest the
12
     plaintiff on May 15th, 2008. Yes or no.
13
               THE FOREPERSON: Yes.
14
               THE CLERK: Did Officer Randall maliciously
15
     prosecute the plaintiff? Yes or no?
16
               THE FOREPERSON: Yes.
17
               THE CLERK: Did Officer Burbridge maliciously
18
     prosecute the plaintiff? Yes or no?
19
               THE FOREPERSON: Yes.
20
               THE CLERK: Did Officer Randall violate plaintiff's
21
     constitutional rights to a fair trial by knowingly presenting
22
     false evidence to the prosecutor? Yes or no.
23
               THE FOREPERSON: Yes.
24
               THE CLERK: Did Officer Burbridge violate
25
     plaintiff's constitutional rights to a fair trial by knowingly
```

Case: 12-2479 Document: 40-1 Page: 122 09/27/2012 731928 126

A1316

405 PROCEEDINGS 1 presenting false evidence to the prosecutor? Yes or no. 2 THE FOREPERSON: Yes. 3 THE CLERK: What amount of money is necessary to compensate the plaintiff for his injuries proximally caused by 4 5 a violation of one or more of his rights by Officer Randall, 6 compensatory damages? 7 THE FOREPERSON: \$70,000. 8 THE CLERK: What amount of money, if any, is 9 necessary to compensate the plaintiff for his injuries 10 proximally caused by violation of one or more of his rights by 11 Officer Burbridge, compensatory damages? 12 THE FOREPERSON: 70,000. 13 THE CLERK: If damages are awarded pursuant to 14 question 4A and the plaintiff is entitled to punitive damages 15 from Officer Randall, what amount of punitive damages for 16 breach of plaintiff's constitutional rights is awarded from Officer Randall, punitive damages? 17 18 THE FOREPERSON: \$25,000. 19 THE CLERK: If damages are awarded pursuant to 20 question 4B and the plaintiff is entitled to punitive damages 21 from Officer Burbridge, what amount of punitive damages for 22 breach of plaintiff's constitutional rights is awarded from 23 Officer Burbridge? 24 THE FOREPERSON: \$25,000. 25 THE COURT: Poll the jury.

Case: 12-2479 Document: 40-1 Page: 123 09/27/2012 731928 126

	PROCEEDINGS 406
1	Thank you. You may sit down.
2	Poll the jury, please.
3	THE CLERK: Did Officer Randall falsely arrest the
4	plaintiff on May 15th, 2008? Yes.
5	Did Officer Burbridge falsely arrest the plaintiff
6	on May 15th, 2008? Yes.
7	Did Officer Randall maliciously prosecute the
8	plaintiff? Yes.
9	Did Officer Burbridge maliciously prosecute the
10	plaintiff? Yes.
11	Did Officer Randall violate plaintiff's
12	constitutional right to a fair trial by knowingly presenting
13	false evidence to the prosecutor? Yes.
14	Did Officer Burbridge violate plaintiff's
15	constitutional right to a fair trial by knowingly presenting
16	false evidence to the prosecutor? Yes.
17	What amount of money, if any, is necessary to
18	compensate the plaintiff for his injuries proximally caused by
19	violation of one or more of his rights by Officer Randall?
20	Compensatory damages, \$70,000.
21	What amount of money, if any, is necessary to
22	compensate the plaintiff for his injuries proximally caused by
23	a violation of one or more of his rights by Officer Burbridge?
2 4	Compensatory damages, \$70,000.
25	If damages are awarded pursuant to question 4A and

Case: 12-2479 Document: 40-1 Page: 124 09/27/2012 731928 126

A1318

407 **PROCEEDINGS** the plaintiff is entitled to punitive damages from Officer 1 2 Randall, what amount of punitive damages for breach of 3 plaintiff's constitutional rights is awarded from Officer Randall? Punitive damages, \$25,000. 4 5 If damages are awarded pursuant to question 43 and 6 the plaintiff is entitled to punitive damages from Officer 7 Burbridge, what amount of punitive damages for breach of 8 plaintiff's constitutional rights is awarded from Officer 9 Burbridge? Punitive damages, \$25,000. 10 Juror Number 1, is that your verdict? 11 THE JUROR: Yes. 12 THE CLERK: Juror Number 2, is that your verdict? 13 THE JUROR: Yes. 14 THE CLERK: Juror Number 3, is that your verdict? 15 THE JUROR: Yes. 16 THE CLERK: Juror Number 4, is that your verdict? 17 THE JUROR: Yes. 1.8 THE CLERK: Juror Number 5, is that your verdict? 19 THE JUROR: Yes. 20 THE CLERK: Juror Number 6, is that your verdict? 21 THE JUROR: Yes. 22 THE CLERK: Juror Number 7, is that your verdict? 23 THE JUROR: Yes. 24 THE CLERK: Juror Number 8, is that your verdict? 25 THE JUROR: Yes.

Case: 12-2479 Document: 40-1 Page: 125 09/27/2012 731928 126

```
408
                         PROCEEDINGS
 1
               THE CLERK: Juror Number 9, is that your verdict?
 2
               THE JUROR: Yes.
 3
               THE CLERK: Juror Number 10, is that your verdict?
 4
               THE JUROR: Yes.
 5
               THE CLERK: Juror Number 11, is that your verdict?
 6
               THE JUROR: Yes.
 7
               THE CLERK: Juror Number 12, is that your verdict?
 8
               THE JUROR: Yes.
 9
               THE CLERK: Jury has been polled, your Honor.
1.0
               THE COURT: Is there any reason why the jury should
11
     not now be discharged?
               MR. NORINSBERG: No, your Honor.
12
13
               MS. GROSS: No, your Honor.
14
               THE COURT: Thank you very much. You're discharged.
15
               You may talk to the attorneys or not, as you wish,
16
     or anybody else, but don't indicate what anybody else said on
17
     the jury. Is that clear? Each of you is entitled to your
18
     privacy. If you want to talk, you can, but not about other
19
     jurors' views.
20
               Thank you very much for your help. Good night.
21
               (The jury exited.)
22
               THE COURT: Any motions?
23
               MS. SANDS: Your Honor, defendants reserve the right
24
     to make all the post-trial motions that they think are
25
     appropriate in this case.
```

Case: 12-2479 Document: 40-1 Page: 126 09/27/2012 731928 126

	PROCEEDINGS	409
1-	THE COURT: Yes.	
2	Nothing else then? Thank you very much.	
3		
4	CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER.	
5	I certify that the foregoing is a correct transcript o	f the
6	record of proceedings in the above-entitled matter.	
7		
3		
)	Judi Johnson, RPR, CRR, CLR Official Court Reporter	
)	official coult Reporter	
-		
2		
3		
ļ		
· •		
)		
7		
}		
)		
)		
L		
2		
3		
5		